

SCIENCE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1917

CONTENTS

The Modern Systematist: DR. L. H. BAILEY.. 623

Patent Reform Prospects: H. J. JEWETT,
BERT RUSSELL 629

Scientific Events:—

*Free Public Medical Lectures; War-time
Work of the Forest Service; War Activities
of the Geological Survey* 632

Scientific Notes and News 634

University and Educational News 638

Discussion and Correspondence:—

*To Members of the American Association for
the Advancement of Science*: PROFESSOR
THEODORE W. RICHARDS. *Antarctic Re-
search and the Problems of the Ice Age*:
MARSDEN MANSON. *Efficient Laboratory
Lighting*: W. M. ATWOOD 638

Scientific Books:—

Lusk's Elements of the Science of Nutrition:
PROFESSOR LAFAYETTE B. MENDEL. *Papers
from the Museum of Zoology of the Univer-
sity of Michigan*: T. BARBOUR 641

Special Articles:—

*The Influence of the Age of an Organism in
maintaining its Acid-base Equilibrium*: DR.
WM. DEB. MACNIDER 643

*The Boston Meeting of the American Chem-
ical Society* 645

THE MODERN SYSTEMATIST¹

WE are still engaged in exploring the earth, that we may understand it. We can not understand any part of the surface of the earth until at least three persons have studied the area carefully: the geologist, the physiographer, the recording biologist. We shall never cease to explore the earth, in old places as well as new. We can never dispense with the recorders.

The older systematic zoology and systematic botany fell into disrepute with the competition of the exacter studies in morphology and physiology, and they have been overshadowed by the interest centering in evolution and its derivative subjects. On the botanical side, the naming of specimens as an exercise in education in schools and the making of a so-called herbarium of snips of plants, have still further discredited whatever seems to be related to systematic work.

Although it is not the purpose of this paper to discuss the educational aspects of the subject, it may nevertheless be said that, so far as one can determine, this school herbarium work did not make botanists, on the one hand, nor lead to an appreciation of nature, on the other, and it would be difficult to trace contributions to science from its suggestion. As an educational method it was faulty because it did not connect plants with either function or environment, nor call for continued application on the part of the pupil. The intensive laboratory course that succeeded it developed exacter methods, more sustained

¹ Before National Academy of Sciences, Philadelphia, November 20, 1917.