

followed by our group in studying Articles 19 and 20 of the code.¹ We cannot help but feel that similar consideration for the zoologists of the world would have greatly promoted confidence and support for international nomenclature.

It is quite true—and it may be made clear at this time—that we dislike some actions that were taken at Paris. Some we regard as catastrophic. On the other hand, some we approve. But all that is not our present concern. Had all these matters, and the over-all rewriting of the code, been considered in line with the established and customary procedures of the International Commission, we should have felt, as we have in the past, morally obligated to follow the decisions even though in many cases they were not to our liking.

In conclusion, it should be reemphasized that in our statement we were not primarily concerned with *what* was done, but *how*. Accordingly, we do not propose to reply here to the letter from Karl P. Schmidt and part of that from Lemche and Spärck, which are not strictly relevant to the present controversy. Even assuming that their views are shared by the majority of zoologists, of which we may be permitted to have a reasonable doubt,² our primary concern is not with philosophy but with procedure. If, as the Chicago Group believes, the commission should, even more than in the past, “resort to the sword of fiat decision,” certainly it would then become even more imperative that established procedures and protocol be meticulously observed, and that the commission so conduct its affairs that all zoologists would have confidence that decisions had been carefully arrived at after due deliberation and with full consideration for all points of view and all pertinent evidence.

¹ An interesting meeting of April 14, 1947 on “The status of errors and emendations” led to the appointment of a study committee. After many hours of work, a report was drafted, distributed to the entire group, and discussed at meetings of May 12 and June 9, 1947. The final version was approved, and published (*Science*, 1947, **106**, 315) in order to get any suggestions from other zoologists before sending it to the commission. After receiving numerous comments, the committee reexamined the problem and revised the statement in a number of particulars. The revised proposal was published (*Science*, 1948, **108**, 37), with a note that it was being presented to the commission as a formal proposal “in order that the Commission might begin consideration of it at the Paris Congress.” (We understood, of course, that because of the one-year rule, we could expect only preliminary consideration at Paris.) Beyond this step, we anticipated that our proposal would eventually be published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, that any zoologist could comment in those pages or in correspondence to the commission, and that the commission of 18 members would then consider the proposal and all comments, take a preliminary vote, and finally, at the next international congress, recommend any appropriate changes in the code.

² Of the replies received to our “Proposed Petition on the Use of the Plenary Powers” (*Science*, 1948, **107**, 543), 156 supported the petition, 7 would go farther in restricting suspensions of the rules, and only 5 opposed the petition and expressed themselves as strongly in favor of suspensions. Incidentally, this petition with all signatures and comments was sent to Mr. Hemming “for presentation and discussion at the meeting of the Commission in Paris,” but we are informed that it was neither presented nor mentioned.

In the long view, no problem in zoological nomenclature is ever so urgent that confidence in the commission need be sacrificed solely to produce an immediate decision.

STEERING COMMITTEE
NOMENCLATURE DISCUSSION GROUP

Washington, D. C.

Scientific Book Register

- Antibiotics: A Survey of Penicillin, Streptomycin, and Other Antimicrobial Substances from Fungi, Actinomycetes, Bacteria, and Plants.** Vols. I and II. H. W. Florey *et al.* New York-London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1949. 1774 pp. \$29.75 the set.
- Sterkfontein Ape-Man Plesianthropus.** Robert Broom, J. T. Robinson and G. W. H. Schepers. Pretoria, South Africa: Transvaal Museum, 1950. 117 pp.
- Volcanological Observations.** Frank Alvord Perret. Washington, D. C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1950. 162 pp. \$5.00 paper; \$5.50 cloth.
- Analytical Absorption Spectroscopy: Absorptimetry and Colorimetry.** M. G. Mellon, Ed. New York: John Wiley; London: Chapman & Hall, 1950. 618 pp. \$9.00.
- Centennial.** Collected papers presented at the Centennial Celebration, Washington, D. C., September 13–17, 1948. Washington 5, D. C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1950. 313 pp. \$5.00.
- An Introduction to Modern Genetics.** 2nd printing. C. H. Waddington. London: Allen & Unwin; New York: Macmillan, 1950. 144 pp. \$3.25.
- Chemical Index of Minerals.** Max H. Hey. London, England: British Museum (Natural History), 1950. 609 pp. £1 10s.
- The Practice of Medicine.** 5th ed. Jonathan Campbell Meakins. St. Louis, Mo.: C. V. Mosby Company, 1950. 1558 pages. \$13.50.
- Advanced Plane Geometry.** C. Zwikker. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publ.; New York: Interscience, 1950. 299 pp. \$6.00.
- Textbook of Endocrinology.** Robert H. Williams, Ed. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1950. 793 pp. \$10.00.
- The Natural Philosophy of Plant Form.** Agnes Arber. London-New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1950. 247 pp. \$5.00.
- Mechanics of Deformable Bodies.** Lectures on Theoretical Physics, Vol. II. Arnold Sommerfeld; trans. from 2nd German ed. by G. Kuerti. New York: Academic Press, 1950. 396 pp. \$6.60.
- Introduction to the Bacteria.** C. E. Clifton. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950. 528 pp. \$5.00.
- Chemistry and Industry of Starch.** Rev. 2nd ed. Ralph W. Kerr, Ed. New York: Academic Press, 1950. 719 pp. \$11.50.
- General Biology for Colleges.** 2nd ed. Gairdner B. Moment. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1950. 680 pp. \$5.00.