

timber types for observation and study. The virgin stands of some of the other distinctive forest types have already been cut away and have thus become lost to plant science and future generations.

IN the article entitled "A Concept of the Ultramicroscopic Virus Diseases and a Classification" by Pro-

fessor Earl B. McKinley, printed in the issue of SCIENCE for November 18, the words "the filtrability of" were omitted from the heading near the top of page 453. It should read: "IV. Virus Diseases with no Cell Inclusions Which are Transmissible and the Filtrability of the Causative Agent has been Definitely Established."

DISCUSSION

EXPLORATIONS IN CHINA

THE Commission for the Preservation of Antiquities read with great surprise the recently published statement, evidently given out by Dr. Roy Chapman Andrews, in which he seemed purposely to mix up a matter of purely scientific interest with the present political situation. In 1928, the commission did voice Chinese public opinion in objecting to Dr. Andrews' expedition, which freely made extensive excavations of paleontological and archeological objects from Chinese territory under the cover of a simple hunting passport. But the commission never ceased to assure the American Museum of Natural History of its friendly attitude toward scientific cooperation, and, in fact, the commission itself in March, 1930, entered into an agreement with Dr. Andrews for a Sino-American cooperative expedition into Inner Mongolia, which was carried to a successful completion. The agreement, while giving full consideration to the scientific interest of the expedition, tried to provide for necessary safeguards of Chinese interest and participation in this important scientific enterprise. But in view of the interest of the American Museum of Natural History in having representative specimens kept in New York, the agreement was so worded as to make possible the transport of the bulk of the collection to America for scientific study, requiring the return to China only of representative duplicates of the fossils and two casts of those specimens without duplicates, so that there will be in China a complete representation of the whole fauna collected. With this agreement approved by the Chinese Government, the bulk of the collections was allowed to be exported to America for scientific study.

It was, however, voluntarily and repeatedly declared by Dr. Andrews, in 1930, that that expedition was to be the last one of a series which he had carried out since 1922. The commission was thus surprised to receive in the spring of 1931 a letter from Dr. Andrews asking for permission for another expedition without any interview with any representative of the commission. Dr. Andrews shortly returned to America and repeatedly attacked the Chinese Government with unfriendly articles in the American press.

Not a word has been received by the commission from Dr. Andrews this time, and the commission has had no knowledge whatsoever of his recent coming to Peiping until his last published statement. Thus the friendly cooperation between the American Museum of Natural History with Chinese scientific institutions has been made difficult, solely because of the unfriendly attitude of its representative, Dr. Andrews himself. The commission anticipates that the American Museum will itself deplore, as does the commission, the recent statement of Dr. Andrews, which is so contrary to the position of justice and friendship taken by the American Government and public in the present unfortunate situation. We are confident that the great American institution does not really intend to use any political weapon to intimidate the Chinese Government, in order to obtain an authorization for scientific cooperation, which this commission is always ready to promote, whenever proposed, on a fair and reasonable basis. With such understanding, the commission again declares itself ready to consider or submit to the proper higher authority or refer to the proper Chinese scientific institution any proposal of Sino-American cooperation for scientific expeditions despite any possible existing personal misunderstanding, and expresses its regret that Dr. Andrews sees fit to make such a declaration, which would make the real attitude of the American Museum misunderstood by the Chinese people.

CHANG CHI, *Chairman*
National Committee for the
Preservation of Antiquities

THE above statement was sent to the president of the American Museum of Natural History on September 24 with the following letter signed by Mr. Chang Chi:

I have the honor to enclose copy of a statement recently issued by this Commission regarding the interruption of the Central Asiatic Expedition which I regard as a most unfortunate breach in the cultural relations between China and the United States. The position of this Commission is clearly defined in that statement. Although I have not had any personal part in the negotiations, I have always fol-

lowed the reports with interest, and regret most deeply that they should have been brought to a close largely by what appears to me to be personal reasons.

That this view is shared by most foreigners in China is clear from the editorial appearing in the American owned and edited *China Weekly Review* of September 10, copy of which is herewith enclosed. While I do not wish it to be thought that we endorse all the opinions expressed in that editorial, and I want particularly to dissociate myself from certain irrelevant statements about Dr. Andrews, it nevertheless serves to call attention to certain difficulties which confronted my associates but which they have not deemed necessary to place too much emphasis before.

I repeat from our statement that this Commission is always ready to promote scientific cooperation, if proposed on a fair and reasonable basis; but that it cannot accept responsibility for failures due to unfriendly attitude exhibited by other parties.

To this letter Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn, president of the American Museum of Natural History, replied on November 14 as follows:

I have your letter of September 24th, regarding the closing of the Central Asiatic Expedition work in China. I agree with you that it is a most unfortunate breach in the cultural relations between your country and the United States.

The American Museum of Natural History entered upon its investigations in 1921 with a full understanding with the Geological Survey of China. It was agreed that we would confine our explorations to regions where the Geological Survey could not work. These districts were clearly specified by Dr. V. K. Ting, then director of the survey. In return, the survey agreed that we could work unhampered in Mongolia. We have satisfactorily carried out our part of the bargain. The Geological Survey, at that time representing the scientific men of North China, has not adhered to its part of the agreement.

Until 1928 the expedition had the most cordial relations with Chinese scientific men. In that year, when the Central Asiatic Expedition returned from Mongolia, its collections were detained at Kalgan without any legal or moral right for six weeks by order of the unofficial body known as the "Cultural Society." The American Museum was astonished at such treatment and naturally highly disturbed. It was charged by the Cultural Society that the expedition went into the field with only "hunting permits." That year the expedition had the same permits that it had had in all preceding years. The Cultural Society, the Geological Survey and the entire world knew exactly upon what work the expedition was engaged.

In 1929, the expedition was not allowed to proceed into the field because of demands made by your commission which we consider were exorbitant and without international precedent.

In 1931, Dr. Andrews came to Peking, at my request, to negotiate with your commission for further work in Mongolia, which had been made necessary by the discoveries of the 1930 expedition. To our great surprise, he was not even accorded the courtesy of an interview by your commis-

sion. Such treatment of the official representative of the American Museum can not be lightly passed over.

After mature deliberation, I decided in conference with the scientific staff that it was useless for the American Museum of Natural History to expend more time and money, trying to carry on scientific work under such obstructive conditions. It was unanimously agreed that the Museum should enter into negotiations with the new government of Manchukuo. It was hoped that a more liberal attitude toward international scientific work would be found among the authorities of the new state. Happily, such was the case, and Dr. Andrews was instructed to close permanently the museum headquarters in Peking and return to America until such time as we wish to resume work from the new base.

In the statement of the commission, which you enclosed, you intimate that Dr. Andrews was not empowered to take this action and that the American Museum of Natural History will deplore such a position. In reply, I may say that Dr. Andrews is vice-director, in charge of exploration and research, of the American Museum of Natural History, and has at all times officially represented the American Museum in China. His action was taken upon my instructions.

In regard to the editorial from the *China Weekly Review*, a copy of which you enclose, I must say that it is quite at variance with other editorials from foreign language publications which have been brought to my attention. I would suggest that you refer to the editorials in *Le Journal de Pekin*, *The Shanghai Times*, *The Shanghai Evening Post and Mercury*, *The China Press*, *The North China Star*, *The P. & T. Times* and *The China Journal*. It is my opinion, derived from these editorials and from many other sources, that the statement in *China Weekly Review* is by no means a true expression of the opinion existing among foreign residents of China.

The American Museum regrets as much as does your commission that the friendly relations which existed between Chinese scientific men and the American Museum of Natural History until 1928 should be thus severed. Such a condition is most unfortunate from every standpoint. I feel, however, that it has been brought about through no fault of ours. Dr. Andrews insisted upon the privilege of completing our work in Mongolia, which was entered into in 1921 under a definite agreement with the Geological Survey. Apparently this has made him unwelcome to your commission. I can not, however, agree that there was any other course open to him.

You state that your commission "is always ready to promote scientific cooperation if proposed upon a fair and reasonable basis." I feel that the proposals made to you by Dr. Andrews were both fair and reasonable. It is difficult to see how it would be profitable for this museum to conduct field work under any other conditions.

EARTH ROTATION AND RIVER EROSION

UNDER the above title SCIENCE for November 11 contains an interesting article by Professor Herman L. Fairchild. After pointing out the minuteness of the deflective force which arises from rotation of the earth, Professor Fairchild gives briefly the results of an examination of topographic maps for the state of