it is placed in the general file, which is indexed according to the author's name or to the name of the first author, in case there are two or more authors. These filing cards also carry the titles and the references and are filed alphabetically according to the author. The author cards are adequate information for one to determine whether he has received a particular reprint. The reprints in the general file are neither given a number nor labeled. However, as soon as several reprints on some subject accumulate in the general files, they are removed and they constitute a new division. The cards in the general files are removed and the new division, number of the reprint in the division and the number in the series are typed in the upper right corner. A title card is made, and if more than one author's name appears on the reprint, cards are made for each of them as described above.

The advantage of having an author's card made for each reprint that is classified is evident for at least two reasons: first, one has all an individual's references filed together and, second, it saves time in determining whether one possesses any of an individual's reprints and if so, which ones. The cross references might not be so essential if a group of individuals should become associated for life and publish all their researches as from one institution, but since a majority of individuals become connected with two or more institutions during their active careers, it is expedient that each author be given an entry for each paper that bears his name.

If a reprint were dated when it arrived, it would often lead to confusion. The chief reason for not doing so is that one often receives reprints from co-authors after one of them has accepted a position elsewhere. If they had published a series of papers, one might receive the last few numbers of the series from one of the authors, and then some months or years later one might receive some of the earlier numbers from the other author. If one had dated the first papers when they arrived, it would be difficult and confusing to explain why the older papers arrived last.

Reprints from several authors that have been bound and sent to me from some individual or institution are not included in either the classified reprint or the general files, but are given space on the shelves with the bound books. However, if reprints of a symposium are bound together, they are filed according to the division they fall into. Such a volume is given as many numbers as it contains individual articles. That is, if a volume of a symposium contains twelve papers, then the numbers on the label would so indicate.

With this system of indexing and filing, it is as easy to locate a reprint, if you know the author or authors, as it is to locate a book on a regular library shelf. At the present time, I have about 4,000 reprints classified and about 1,500 more in the general files. The classified reprints are filed in steel and wooden drawers, while the general reprints are filed in boxes.

EMMETT B. CARMICHAEL
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

STARS IN THE BIOGRAPHICAL DIRECTORY OF AMERICAN MEN OF SCIENCE

IN view of the publication of a sixth edition of the "Biographical Directory of American Men of Science" I feel impelled to make some remarks about the affixing of stars to certain of the names. The selection of such names is made on a basis that is not very clear to me, and I doubt that it is well defined in the mind of the editor himself. The latter uses such designations as "leading scientific men," "most eminent men," "first —among research workers."

Now I must confess that I regard these elections to stardom as a somewhat childish albeit amusing pastime, but I understand that in some institutions the possession or lack of a star is taken very seriously and may even be decisive in questions of appointment and promotion. In view of that fact I would like to urge that the criterion on which selection is made be given a clearer definition. It should be pointed out that a "leading scientific man" is not necessarily synonymous with a "leader in scientific research." A biologist may be renowned as a writer of text-books and yet have a very poor record in the field of original research. He may be indefatigable and able in the administrative activities of scientific societies and still have only the most superficial interest in scientific discovery. But if eminence may rest on any one of such widely different endeavors it is only fair that that fact be definitely understood. Certainly the editor should make it clear that at present these eminent scientists are not necessarily outstanding research workers.

Personally I would much prefer to see the custom of starring abandoned altogether. I seriously question the justification for printing the results of such an election in a volume which is nothing more nor less than a directory.

FRANZ SCHRADER
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

THE PERCENTAGE OF IRON IN HEMOGLOBIN

IT is known that the percentage of iron in different mammalian hemoglobins is substantially the same. In attempting to look up this rather fundamental value for use in teaching, we found the value 0.0335 given in Hawk and Bergeim's "Practical Physiological Chemistry" (10th ed., p. 467), in Starling's "Human Physiology" (7th ed., p. 652), in Bodansky's "Introduction to Physiological Chemistry" (3rd ed., p. 234),