also notices), such as 'socius,' 'organic' and 'reflective' sympathy, are used with no intimation of their origin.

'My terms,' Professor Baldwin calls 'socius,' 'organic' and 'reflective sympathy.' We do not suppose that he claims to have coined the word 'socius,' while the specific concept to which Professor Giddings has attached it, if we understand his language, he repudiates. The terms 'organic' and 'reflective' sympathy might conceivably be claimed as inventions in technical nomenclature. But on page 220 of Professor Baldwin's 'Social and Ethical Interpretations' we find the following quit claim:

"Psychologists are generally agreed in finding a distinction necessary between 'organic' and 'reflective' sympathy, similar to the distinction which has been made in considering modesty."

But terms are, of course, minor matters. Let us turn at once to the pure essence of Appendix D. Here it is:

"Whenever the situation depicted by Adam Smith's 'Illustration' was realized—cases involving the sight of both an aggressor and an aggressee with their respective claims upon the onlooker B for sympathy—the creature whose shape, movements, postures, cries, etc., *were like those of B* would be the one which would supply B's copy-system and the one with which his cooperations would arise; that is *the animal of the same kind.* So subjective sympathy would at once be a 'consciousness of kind' and the objective reactions would be indicative of 'kind.'"

The quality of Professor Giddings' dishonesty is now revealed. In a review of Professor Baldwin's book Professor Giddings has put in 'his way' certain things that Professor Baldwin had put in 'his way' in Appendix D, and Professor Baldwin's way—in Appendix D—consists in putting quotation marks about Giddings' way.

In conclusion I would repeat with Professor Small 'there is glory enough to go round.' This means that it is not necessary to vilify other scientists' efforts and work in order to raise the value of one's own contributions. If Professor Baldwin would only remember what he owes to M. Tarde he would certainly hesitate to accuse others of plagiarism.

NEW YORK CITY. GUSTAVO TOSTI.

CARNEGIE INSTITUTION.

THE Advisory Committee in Astronomy will be glad to receive information or suggestions, regarding investigations in astronomy which should be aided by the Carnegie Institution. It is advisable that applications should be made as soon as possible. They may be addressed to the Chairman of the Committee, Cambridge, Mass.

EDWARD C. PICKERING, *Chairman.*
LEWIS BOSS.
GEORGE E. HALE, *Secretary.*
S. P. LANGLEY.
SIMON NEWCOMB.

CAMBRIDGE, March 29, 1902.

SHORTER ARTICLES.

DISCHARGE FROM HOT PLATINUM WIRES.

DURING the past year I have been investigating the discharge from a hot platinum wire, and the results of this work may, perhaps, be of interest to others. An article has been recently published by Rutherford* on the same subject, in which he determined the velocity of the positive ions and showed that at higher temperatures their average velocity was less than at lower. My own work was intended to compare the velocities of the positive and negative ions and to explain as far as possible the decrease in the velocity at higher temperatures.

By a method similar to one which I had previously used in studying the discharge from a flame† it was shown that the average velocity of the positive ions is greater than that of the negative. By a method similar to one used by Zeleny‡ it was shown that the most rapidly moving positive ions have a greater velocity than the most rapidly moving negative ones. By a modification of this method it was shown that the most slowly moving positive ions given off at lower temperature move comparatively rapidly, but that at higher temperatures some are sent off which

* SCIENCE, 14, 590, and *Phys. Rev.*, 13, 321.
† *Phys. Rev.*, 12, 65.
‡ *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond.*, 195, 193.