

Brisson: "Regnum animale in Classes IX distrib." 1762.

Brunnich: "Zoologiae Fundamenta praelectionibus academicis accommodata." 1772.

Gronovius: "Zoophylacii Gronoviana Fasciculus I." 1763.

Gronovius: "Zoophylacium Gronovianum," etc. 1781.

Geoffroy: "Histoire abrégée des Insectes, etc." 1762.

"Museum Calonnianum." 1797.

Okén: "Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte." 1816.

This list will be enlarged by the commission.

IV. Also, in determining matters of priority, certain other publications shall be ignored, among them articles in encyclopedias, popular works of travel, journals of hunting and fishing, catalogues, garden journals, agricultural periodicals, political and local newspapers and other non-scientific journals which are without influence in systematic science.

Those who are willing to subscribe to these additions and emendations of the nomenclatorial laws are earnestly requested to sign and send to Professor Dr. A. Brauer, Zoologisches Museum, Invalidenstrasse, Berlin, Germany, a postal card to the effect "I am in sympathy with the propositions of the German Zoological Society to restrict the law of priority and authorize my name to be appended to them."

It is hardly necessary to add anything to the matters referred to above. A single glance at the list of generic names which it is proposed to have removed from the rules will convince any one that the changes otherwise necessary would result in endless confusion without a single gain to science. The other proposals also will appeal to all who are not firmly wedded to an inflexible law with all the deplorable results that must follow. It is only by having many names appended to the proposals that the changes can be carried through the next congress. It is to be regretted that the time selected for the Monaco meeting is such that most Americans will be prevented from attending, but this has seemed

necessary from the matter of climate and the times of the European vacations.

J. S. KINGSLEY

DOMES THEORIES AS APPLIED TO GULF COAST GEOLOGY

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: In a recent number of SCIENCE (June 21) is found a communication by Captain A. F. Lucas in which he states without any qualifications that the undersigned "claims the entire credit for the discovery and promulgation of 'the dome theory' of the accumulation of oil in the Gulf Coastal Plain." The statements are found so "misleading" that he feels it his duty to correct them. This he endeavors to do by quoting the article in full and following the same by quotations from those familiar with oil development along this coast.

The misinterpretations the Captain has put upon my article seem to have their origin in our different conceptions of what is implied by a "dome theory." That various theories at various times, each with some excellent and some weak points, have been suggested to account for the dome structures of our coast we know full well. But that there is an acknowledged one styled "the dome theory" is news to the undersigned. That this writer does claim the credit for the discovery and promulgation of "a dome theory" he will have to admit. Others will have to make similar admissions. Even the Captain mentions entering Texas with a "nascent dome theory" in his mind. Possibly this one after successful birth has grown into "the dome theory." However, judging from the tenor of the Captain's article, including quotations, it seems that the phrase, "the dome theory," has often been used to imply simply short anticlinal or quaquavasal structures with local oil concentrations. If such be the general acceptance of the phrase then the writer must frankly admit that the "credit for the discovery and promulgation of" the dome theory of the accumulation of oil in the Gulf coastal plain is not his. The tendency of hydrocarbons to accumulate in anticlines,

long or short, was a well-known fact long before the development of the coastal oil fields. That the coastal plain contained structural irregularities—as at Sulphur—was early discussed by Hilgard, as all students of Louisiana geology must admit. The idea was temporarily discounted by some subsequent writers who saw no signs of structural complications at the surface. The drill has settled all this. What the nature or origin of such irregularities really was as hinted at by Captain Lucas in the expression “nascent dome theory” we have little from his pen to indicate. Some said afterwards that his ideas were thus and so; even the Captain seems now to prefer to quote from these sources rather than from contemporary statements of his own. However, to Captain Lucas belongs the credit of not only believing that something worth while was under Spindletop (as Higgins did ten years before) but of influencing capital to go in with him in making a thorough test (for sulphur?).

In studying the geology of the coastal plain for some ten or a dozen years the writer has had occasion not only to learn what others have thought as to the origin of those remarkable coastal structures, but to make observations and collections in the field for himself. He too has proposed a “nascent” or at least an embryonic dome theory (not claiming it as “the dome theory”) whereby the “movement upwards of huge masses of rock salt,” etc., must produce structures, not only of the well-known inverted saucer-shape at top, but of upturned, pinched out, slickensided beds along their flanks. All these when there is an alternation of pervious and impervious beds may aid in oil concentration. Lateral or flank oil, in contradistinction to crest oil as at Beaumont, is well known at Anse-la-Butte, Vinton and now at Pine Prairie and doubtless occurs in paying quantities at Belle Isle, Sulphur and many other domes. The insistence by the writer on the proper locations for oil in the “flank” condition is what the director of the Myles Mineral Co. had in mind when he wrote:

I consider this a most remarkable vindication of a theory originated by you and we attribute a large measure of success thus far to your advice.

With all the above facts in mind the undersigned still sees no harm in referring to the workings of his own dome theory, provided he labels it as such—as he did. Nor can he see how such references can in any way detract from the credit due Captain Lucas for his views on dome structure—whatever they were.

As a parting shot the Captain calls attention to my incompetency in “locating wells” because the Producers well at Pine Prairie “failed to produce.” Allow me to state I had no hand in its location. It is too far away from the flanks of the dome for any economic results. So far, the locations I have approved have yielded oil or gas or both in fair quantities. Can others say more?

G. D. HARRIS

PINE PRAIRIE, LA.,
June 29, 1912

UNIVERSITY CONTROL

LETTERS FROM CORNELL UNIVERSITY

It is certainly curious, to say the least, that in a democratic country we should have developed what is apparently a monarchical system of university government, whereas in monarchical countries they have democratic systems of university control. However, I doubt whether the government of American universities is really as monarchical as it sounds, or as the organization would suggest. Of course, there are good systems of government and bad systems of government as such, but the success of any system depends in the end largely on the personality of the members of the board and of the president. It is possible to work out a thoroughly democratic system even under the monarchical form that we have established in this country. I am afraid that a discussion of this question is likely to be largely academic, for I do not see any reason for thinking that we shall be able to make any radical departures in the general philosophy of the administration of our institutions. In the case of state institutions particularly, the representatives of the people