liantly carrying on studies which are a part of the amazing advance of modern physics. The doctoral candidate in geology frequently ranges the same plains and mountains first viewed by the pioneers, not yet all traversed by automobile roads, and frequently is obliged to defer completion of his thesis for some years after completing residence requirements because of his difficulty in singlehandedly carrying on operations in a remote field. A few of our universities have helped to meet these primitive difficulties of geologic investigation by providing organized camps and the like. Many others, while freely providing the instruments and laboratories of physics and making research in this branch "physically" easy, have not only failed to sponsor field work in geology adequately, but have refused to accept as dissertation material work done under those competent national or state agencies which are giving institutional support to research in geology!

Such policies have diverted groups of able students to other universities having a more liberal policy in this regard. The ground has been taken by some universities and other fellowship agencies that "expeditions" should not be sponsored, while money for the purchase of laboratory equipment in other branches was freely offered and considered better spent. It appears that the glamor and news value and tangibility of laboratory or instrumental research has operated in some degree to the relative detriment of such prosaic work as deciphering the history of the earth.

It has been charged that benefactors of universities have been prone to build buildings which could be seen, but have rarely provided the means to maintain and operate them for the purpose stipulated. It is equally true that universities, foundations, and the like, have often been victims of the tendency to favor tangible and newsworthy, rather than necessarily fundamental, support and facilities for research. Thus a million dollars spent to learn more about the occurrence and origin of the ores of certain metals might result in a few books on ore deposits; a million dollars spent on an astronomical observatory would result not only in an equal number of books, but also in a magnificent telescope and an imposing building bearing the name of the donor.

Is it not quite obvious that the offering of some of our outstanding prizes for research tend to an overemphasis in spectacular fields? Science Service no doubt has some estimate of the relative newsworthiness of advances in various sciences, but even without such estimate we know that a fact can be the better "sold" if it has been captured by means of some instrument that is larger or smaller or more refined or more costly than its predecessors, or if its learning has involved the counting of a million or ten to any other n^{th} flies or atoms or the like. The writer knows dozens of geologists who have individually cracked off the outcrop enough rock specimens to build and fill a geological museum, but somehow, though we believe geologic information has value, few of us have been successful in making news capital out of the length, width, height and style of architecture of said museum.

Recently there has appeared the review of another book set forth as an ably compiled résumé of science. It was compiled by visiting outstanding laboratories, and it is the fear of the writer, though he has not seen the book and may be agreeably surprised, that the largest laboratory of all, that in which both geologic evolution and its understanding by man are worked out, was not included in the itinerary. Neither its processes nor the current methods for their interpretation, excepting perhaps the modern divining rods of geophysics, have the gadget appeal which seems so all-important to the public, and which we fear is not without its influence in circles closer to science.

And so we return with no real answer to the question as to whether geology is a science. But until we have an answer, might we not have "A New History of Science," including (or excluding) geology, which would at least not raise false hopes on the part of a perennially hopeful digger for terrestrial lore.

CHESTER K. WENTWORTH
BOARD OF WATER SUPPLY
HONOLULU, T. H.

A PLEA TO PUBLISHERS OF SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

EVERY scientist receives advertisements of many more forthcoming books than he can afford to purchase. My own recent practice has been to make a bibliographic card for each work in which I am interested and to file it so that it will be at least listed in my bibliography until finances permit, or necessity compels, the purchase of the volume. Frequently in making these cards I have been annoyed by the failure of the publisher to give the date of publication, the number of pages and other necessary details, even when the advertising brochure is elaborately printed and illustrated. Let us presume that several such incomplete cards, representing a given subject, are on file and that you wish to select from the titles available. On what basis can selection be made? The book can not be chosen on the basis of modernity, size or illustrative matter, for none of these facts is known. The alternative, of course, is to make a trip to the nearest library whenever a sufficient number of cards has accumulated and to fill in the missing data from the Library of Congress cards. Many of us naturally object to this expenditure of time in the search for the very information which the publisher should have supplied.

To satisfy my own curiosity as to the extent of this

practice, I prepared bibliographic cards for each of the last twenty-five book advertisements which I have received. As the twenty-five were not selected in any way, even this small series may be presumed to give a fair sampling of publishing practice. These brochures represented twelve leading publishing houses in the United States and Great Britain. In only *one* instance was a date given on the brochure itself, and in only three additional cases could the year of publication be inferred from a dated sales letter which accompanied the advertising folder. The number of pages was stated in eleven instances, but the number of illustrations was given only nine times. In every case the price of the book was mentioned, but I can recall having received advertisements in which even the price was omitted!

It is my considered opinion that the publishers of scientific books would sell more copies and would earn the gratitude of scientists by reducing the elaborateness of their brochures and by sending with each advertisement a 3×5 bibliographic card patterned after a Library of Congress card. I am aware that several American publishing houses now follow this practice, and I hope that the custom will become general. Many of us would take the trouble to file such cards where they would be available for reference, even though we might not be able to purchase many of the volumes. Every one has had the experience, I think, of being called upon to recommend a book in some borderline field and being unable to recall the author or title of a book which would exactly meet the request and about which one's only memory is that the bulky advertisement which called it to his attention was chucked into the waste basket some months previously.

Another valid complaint against publishers, I believe, is their almost uniform failure to send announcements of children's books in a given field to their mailing list of scientific workers in that field. Those of us who are located in museums are called on to recommend fully as many children's books as technical works. As the Christmas season approaches many a puzzled mother, anxious to cater to the strange tastes of her son, telephones to me for a list of popular books on reptiles, and only the kindness of a local library which allows me to preview each new herpetological children's title enables me to answer such inquiries.

M. GRAHAM NETTING

CARNEGIE MUSEUM

NOTICE OF POSSIBLE SUSPENSION OF RULES OF NOMENCLATURE IN CERTAIN CASES

ATTENTION of the zoological profession is invited to the fact that request for the "Suspension of the Rules" has been made in the following cases, on the ground that "the strict application of the Régles will clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity." According to procedure one year's notice is hereby published, "making it possible for zoologists, particularly specialists in the group in question, to present arguments for or against the suspension under consideration."

Note A.—Suspend rules.

Note B.—Insert in Official List with the type as given in parentheses.

COELENTERATA.—*Monograptus* Geinitz, 1852 (*priodon*); A, B.

Retiolites Barrande, 1850 (*geinitzianus*); A, B.

Graptolithus Linn., 1768, to be suppressed; A.

ECHINODERMATA.—*Luidia* Forbes, 1839 (*fragilissima*); A, B.

NEMATODA.—*Anguina* Scopoli, 1777 (*Vibrio tritici*) to be suppressed; A.

CRUSTACEA.—*Squilla* Fabricius, 1787 (*mantis*); A, B.

INSECTA.—The so-called "Erlangen List" of 1801 to be suppressed.

ORTHOPTERA.—*Locusta* Linn., 1758 (*Gryllus Locusta migratorius* Linn., 1758); *Phaneroptera* Serville, 1831 (*Gryllus falcatus* Poda, 1761); A, B.

HYMENOPTERA.—*Cimbex* Olivier, 1790 (*Tenthredo lutea* Linn., 1758); A, B. *Crabro* Fabricius, 1775 (*Sphex cribraria* Linn., 1767); A, B. *Lasius* Fabricius, 1805 (*Formica nigra* Linn., 1758); A, B. *Anthophora* Latreille, 1803 (*Apis pilipes* Fabr., 1775); A, B. *Ichneumon* Linn., 1758 (*Ichneumon extensorius* Linn., 1758); A, B. *Pimpla* Fabr., 1804 (*Ichneumon instigator* Fabr., 1793); A, B. *Ephialtes* Gravenhorst, 1829 (*Ichneumon manifestator* Linn., 1758); A, B. *Bracon* Fabr., 1805 (*Bracon minutator* Fabr., 1798); A, B. *Pompilus* Fabr., 1798 (*Pompilus pulcher* Fabr., 1798); A, B. *Bethylus* Latreille, 1802 (*Omalus fuscicornis* Jurine, 1807); A, B. *Prosopis* Jurine, 1807 (*Sphex signator* Panzer, [1798]); A, B. *Ceraphron* Jurine, 1807 (*Ceraphron sulcatus* Jurine, 1807); A, B. *Torymus* Dalman, 1820 (*Ichneumon bedeguaris* Linn., 1758); A, B. *Proctotrupes* Latreille, 1796 (*Proctotrupes brevipennis* Latreille, 1802); A, B. *Sphex* Linn., 1758 (*Sphex flavipennis* Fabr., 1793); A, B. *Ammophila* Kirby, 1798 (*Sphex sabulosa* Linn., 1758); A, B.

LEPIDOPTERA.—In interpreting the generic names assigned by Freyer in his *Neuere Beiträge zur Schmetterlingskunde* to the species there described, each species is to be regarded as having been described by Freyer as belonging to the genus cited by him at the head of each description and not to the genus with which he actually associated the specific name. For example, Freyer described, under the genus *Hipparchia* Fabricius, a species to which he gave the