

in respect to the use of minutiae of technique etc. that the author would not think worth mentioning anyway, even in case he had originated them himself, not are acknowledgements to be expected where the material made use of and its source have already become generally known in some way, not where the points involved would be generally recognized as being quite obvious. Where on the other hand a method or result that would generally not be regarded as obvious, has been originated independently by a given worker, but parallels similar work or suggestions that have later become known to him through public or private, direct or indirect communications of another investigator, it is obvious that the former, in publishing his work, need not acknowledge assistance from the latter, but is nevertheless in duty bound to mention the fact that his method, conclusion or suggestion, though independent, is the same as that which he knows the other worker has also arrived at. Thirdly, far from the consent of the original author being required for acknowledgements, his consent should rather be required in case it is desired not to make mention of a communication of his which has played a role in work that the other author is publishing, and this requirement has much more pertinence in a case like that under consideration, where the communication was not made in an official publication, than where it was so made, since in the latter case the original author has, after all, a certain amount of protection in the words themselves. Only on such an understanding can contributors to the circular be expected to continue to furnish contributions, just as they would only (by word of mouth or letter), so long as such a standard of conduct was observed. Experience has shown that it is unfortunately only too true that such overt understandings must be reached beforehand, even in the case of scientists, in order that real cooperation may be possible.

H. J. Muller Concerning material to be published. It is not always possible to know at the time of sending in a contribution just whether or not the material will be published, or, if published, when, but it would seem wise to send it in to the circular anyway (supposing the policy on acknowledgements above outlined is accepted), provided the information or suggestions sent in might be of considerable use to the readers between the time of appearance of the circular and of the official publication. This would apply especially in cases where actual publication is only doubtful, or might be long delayed. In other words, it would seem wise not to limit the material in the circular in the manner stated, to material which is "not ordinarily suitable for publication", or to material, the publication of which is not expected at all. Certainly a good deal of the material in the last circular would be worth eventual publication.