

satisfactory price, but I do strongly object to paying some 20,000 marks more for the set than would a German in Germany; in other words to having the dealer make that profit out of me.

Professor K. A. Hofmann, speaking before the German Chemical Society, justified the present German procedure in the following words:

Von einzelnen unserer ausländischen Mitglieder sind Beschwerden eingegangen, weil wir wegen der Valuta-Verhältnisse das Ausland neuerdings anders behandeln mussten als das Inland. Wie ich kaum hinzuzufügen brauche, handelt es sich hier um Vorübergehende Massnahmen, die mit dem Eintritt normaler Zustände wieder verschwinden werden. Keineswegs, das möchte ich hier ausdrücklich feststellen, haben wir die Absicht, unsere ausländischen Mitglieder prinzipiell anders zu behandeln als die inländischen. Wegen der Entwertung der Reichsmark hatten sich jedoch Verhältnisse herausgebildet, denen zufolge das Ausland unsere Veröffentlichungen für den zwanzigsten Teil des früheren Preises kaufen konnte, während die deutschen Mitglieder das Doppelte zahlen mussten. Der Vorstand, welchem satzungsgemäss die Festsetzung der Preise unserer Veröffentlichungen zusteht, hat dann, vielfachen dringenden Anregungen aus Mitgliederkreise entsprechend, die Auslandspreise erhöht und so festgesetzt, dass unsere ausländischen Mitglieder immer noch weniger zu zahlen haben, als dies früher im Frieden der Fall war. Wir stehen auf dem Standpunkt, dass *ein etwaiger Valuta-Gewinn einzig und allein der Gesellschaft zusteht, nicht aber dem einzelnen ausländischen Mitgleid.* (Italics ours.) . . . Glaubt man, wir würden hier beschliessen, die 'Berichte' im Ausland für $\frac{1}{2}$, das 'Zentralblatt' für $\frac{1}{3}$ und die beiden ersten Bände des 'Beilstein' für zusammen 1 dollar zu verkaufen? Jedes Buch hat doch einen bestimmten Welthandelswert, und der muss aufrecht erhalten werden.

From the German standpoint this sounds very reasonable, but take the case of the "Berichte." The subscription in Germany and Austria is 45 marks; in America it is \$7.50. At present exchange (1.13) \$7.50 in American money is worth 664 marks in Berlin. In other words, an American pays more than 650 marks for that which is sold to a German for 45 marks.

In a recent publication I noticed the following extract from a German firm to an American customer, whose name had given the impression that he was a German:

A word about prices. I take it from your name and connections that you are of German family and am therefore prepared to make most liberal terms. As you doubtless know, it has been generally agreed in commercial circles here that all articles sold to *utlanders*, and especially to Americans, shall be priced considerably higher than the same thing sold to our fellow-citizens, the idea being to in this way recuperate to some extent from our late overwhelming losses and to make our recent enemies aid us in paying our most outrageous and crushing war debt.

This policy has been adopted *en bloc* by our associated . . . since some time. But as a fellow German, I am prepared to let you have these goods at the Berlin price, this of course being in all confidence, my most dear sir.

What course should a purchaser take who wishes to deal fairly, not only to the Germans, but to himself?

JAS. LEWIS HOWE

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

Psychology of Nationality and Internationalism. By W. B. PILLSBURY. D. Appleton and Company, New York and London. 1920. Pp. 314.

The phenomena of collective life have in recent days evoked a great number of half-analyzed conclusions and assertions. A welcome relief from these is the present book, which represents the analysis of one whose point of view is supported by a background of empirical science. There is undertaken an analysis of the nature and development of the national consciousness, and of the place of the nation as an ideal in history, in the conduct and thought of individuals, and in the relations of states to each other.

Definitions of the nation are submitted to criticism. Neither language nor descent gives the key to the common spirit of a nation. Nor is the nation merely an extension of familial or tribal organization. Nationality is first of all a psychological and sociological problem.

It is the common ideals of its members that make the nation. To know to what national group an individual belongs the simplest way is to ask him.

The instinctive gregarious and sympathetic reactions, the fear of group disapproval, these give the constitutional basis, which explain why there is any grouping at all. But it is the acquisition of common ideals, within the individual's own life, that gives the group its persistent unity and determines its membership. The nation as an ideal exists only in the minds of its separate members, but when it does exist it unites them for action. It becomes a common center of thought and emotion, its prestige determines the conduct of the individual in much the same way as does his concept of his self. Although the social mind is but a metaphor, the nation, as a concept, is as real as is the self of the individual, and in the same sense. But the original instincts, the thoughts, the acts, are the instincts, thoughts and acts of individuals, throughout, and the ideals exist only in individual minds, which are themselves always changing in identity.

The development of the nation as a common ideal or concept is favored by, but does not depend solely upon, such incidents as a common ancestry, language, literature, historical continuity, a home land, and definite geographical boundaries. It is especially favored by the urgencies of common danger and the ensuing development of common hatreds of opposing groups. A common hate is one of the most frequently effective factors in making or uniting a nation or a smaller group within the nation. Common fears and animosities in all wars, rather than mutual sympathy and admiration, are what bind the allies into a solid whole. Nationality thrives on opposition.

Since nationality is acquired rather than innate, its affiliations may under appropriate conditions be changed and its loyalties shifted. A chapter is given to the process of naturalization, its conditions, aids, and objective signs. In part the aids to naturalization and amalgamation are identical with those that led to the

development of nations in history. Especially useful are change of habits, language, standards of living. Effective also are the pressure of contempt, group approval of those who change, influence of children who adopt the new ideals and scorn the old. Even race prejudice is seen to play its part as an aid to change in nationality.

The development of the national ideals and standards and the peculiarities of the ideals of different nations are illustrated by sketches of the rise of national spirit in the ancient and modern states. Accounts of the nation as a mob are critically examined and found in the main false. For the most part the nation thinks as does a sane individual in isolation, and the final decisions usually attain the level of the average intelligence. The results of this thinking, the successful conventions and approved ideals, are embodied in the law, in formal government, and the machinery of the state. The relation of the state to the nation is that the state embodies and provides a means for realizing the ideals of the nation. Naturally the means lags behind the ideals.

Whether nationality represents the extreme development of organization or whether it is possible to go beyond and find a larger unity in a community of states is considered in the last chapter. Smaller group loyalties within the nation are shown not to prevent but rather to facilitate the growth of national spirit. So might the rivalry of nations be made an element in inciting to progress in the international community. In no single respect does the psychology of nationality offer any reasonable objection to the formation of an international society or League of Nations, although the super-national state might have to rely to greater degree on the more cooperative instincts, in the absence of the thrilling and amalgamating influence of a common hate.

This review can not hope to give an adequate summary of the book, with its many pertinent problems, its sane and reasonable analysis of them, and its keen interpretation of social phenomena always on the ground that all psychology is of individuals. The failure

to distinguish clearly between "the group" and what we may designate as "unspecified individuals"; the use of the term "society" for forgotten sources of suggestion or for influential individuals, may be occasionally disappointing to the reader whose psychology is still more individualistic than that of the author. The conclusion that low intelligence is not an innate but "merely an acquired characteristic" may not seem necessarily to follow from the evidence presented, and is at least at variance with current views concerning the nature of intelligence. But these are minor points. The general reader and the specialist alike will welcome the book as a substantial contribution to the subject of collective psychology.

H. L. HOLLINGWORTH

CALL FOR A MEETING OF GENETICISTS INTERESTED IN AGRICULTURE

THERE is a steadily increasing number of teachers and investigators in the country interested in genetics in its relation to agriculture. The greater proportion of these are connected with agricultural colleges and experiment stations, and in this relationship they encounter a distinctive set of problems and responsibilities. These include questions of organization, scope of teaching and investigation, cooperation, relation to extension activities, and the like. As an example, take the matter of organization, which involves both intradepartmental and interdepartmental relations. Is it preferable that the genetics work and workers in an institution should be brought together in a single departmental organization, or can the interests of the institution, the students and the investigational projects be best served by having different geneticists on the staff attached to such existing departments as animal husbandry, horticulture and agronomy? Each of these plans doubtless has its advantages and its disadvantages.

The question of where and by whom the elementary course in genetics should be taught, and what its scope should be, is an-

other important question on which practise varies greatly in different institutions. To what extent, if at all, should investigators in agricultural experiment stations be limited in their investigations to projects which have more or less immediate practical application? And to what extent can the results of recent advances in genetics be put before the practical breeder and be made of use to him? These examples will serve to indicate the nature of some of the problems which face the geneticists in agricultural institutions. It is felt by those whose names are appended to this letter that much benefit might be derived from a conference of such workers, at which these and other similar questions might be discussed, since mutual advantage could doubtless be derived from the ideas and experience of others. To this end we are proposing that an attempt be made to arrange for such a conference to be held in connection with the meetings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and affiliated societies in Chicago this winter. The most feasible date can not be stated at this time; it might be necessary, in order to avoid conflicts, that those interested in this project should come a day earlier or stay over a day later than the other meetings.

The organization of a formal society is not at present contemplated, and it should be emphasized that it is not proposed to have a meeting for the presentation of technical papers in genetics, provision for which is already made on the programs of various societies. This is contemplated purely as a conference for the discussion of the problems peculiar to the geneticists of agricultural institutions or other persons interested in the application of genetics to agriculture. Correspondence and suggestions are solicited from all who may be interested in promoting or attending such a meeting. Address communications to L. J. Cole, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

E. B. Babcock, professor of genetics, University of California.

Leon J. Cole, professor of genetics, University of Wisconsin.