

use of unfamiliar terms. If I may without offense take a concrete instance, I would suggest that the author of the interesting note, 'Ecological Problems connected with Alpine Vegetation' (p. 459), might find it to the advantage of his subject, his audience and himself if he would rewrite his paper without using the words ecology (or œcology), phytogeography, morphology, floristic, edaphic, and xerophyte, or their derivatives.

F. A. BATHER.

BOTANICAL NOMENCLATURE.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: It occurs to me after reading Dr. Cook's truly melancholy account of the condition of nomenclature in botany, to point out that the vast majority of the tribulations from which that nomenclature is suffering would be nonexistent if botanists had simply been willing to stand by the rules accepted by practically all zoologists. All the terrible examples he cites from Hernandez drop out of sight at once on the application of the rule that vernacular names are not to be accepted. Ninety-nine hundredths of the rest disappear with the fixation of 1758 ('Systema Naturæ,' Ed. X.) as the date beyond which resurrectionists shall not disturb the tombs.

It is true that all bodies of men contain a certain proportion of freaks and that some may be cited among zoologists, and a certain number of persons who have not made a study of nomenclature as an art, persist in injecting sentimental considerations into their argument and practice.

But these as a rule have not succeeded, in this country, in disturbing systematic work or diverting attention from the goal of stability which most zoologists aim at.

With an international committee to decide the fate of the residue of preposterous names which no rules can eliminate, I think a comparatively few years would put zoological nomenclature on a solid and permanent basis. And if botanists would 'hark back' to De Candolle and rigorously apply his rules, they also might see the dawn of a better day.

WM. H. DALL.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
April 26, 1902.

THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE, NOT OF AN OLIGARCHY.

PROFESSOR WILLIAM T. SEDGWICK, of Boston, in an address published in SCIENCE, January 10, 1902, 'confesses with sorrow' the lack of success of efforts to prevent the study of 'temperance physiology' as now required in the public schools of this country.

He first offers in defense of his opposition the fact that Horace Mann, in 1842, did not include temperance physiology in his essay on 'The Study of Physiology in the Schools,' but he omits to add the significant accompanying fact of history, namely, that the recommendations of Horace Mann's essay that 'physiology should be taught in the schools,' aroused in Massachusetts such a storm of bitter opposition from the doctors and men of official science, that the existence of the Massachusetts State Board of Education and its secretary, Horace Mann, were saved by only a hair's breadth from being entirely legislated out of office. But time has vindicated Horace Mann's recommendations, while his opponents are forgotten.

Sixty years have passed and Massachusetts, as well as every state in the United States and the National Congress, has made physiology and hygiene, which latter includes the nature and effects of alcoholic drinks and other narcotics, a mandatory public school study. Professor Sedgwick is now objecting, not to this study, he says, but to the legal specifications which have made it a success. First he objects to its being taught 'to all pupils.' He does not tell when or by what class of pupils he would have it omitted. In our country 'all pupils' of to-day are destined to be the sovereign people of to-morrow. Hence, looked at from the standpoint of the state, it can not afford that one single pupil should not receive the utmost instruction on this subject needed to fit that pupil for a future sovereignty of intelligent sobriety.

From the standpoint of the individual, we ask, From whose child shall this educational method for the prevention of intemperance be withheld? Shall it be from the children of the poor, the rich, the foreign-born or the home-born? We are answered by the command of the greatest of all teachers that the supreme