Comments and Communications

The Kirk Bryan Memorial Award

A GROUP of friends and professional colleagues of the late Kirk Bryan, of Harvard University, wishing to provide a fitting and enduring tribute to his accomplishments as teacher and scientist, have arranged for a Kirk Bryan Memorial Award, under the auspices of the Geological Society of America. It is hoped that this form of memorial will be representative of Professor Bryan's wide circle of friends in the different sciences, will signalize his achievements in coordinating the methods of geomorphology, geography, archaeology, soil science, and other fields in attacking common problems concerned with the Pleistocene, and will stimulate further research along the lines in which he pioneered.

The award will consist of two parts: an inscribed certificate and a cash stipend for the encouragement of research. The award is to be presented at the annual meetings of the Geological Society, at suitable intervals, to the author or authors of outstanding contributions in geomorphology or in the bordering fields in which Professor Bryan was particularly interested. The recipient of the award will be selected by a committee appointed by the Geological Society, and preference will be given to the younger men of the profession.

The award is to be based on the income from a Bryan Memorial Fund, set up within the Geological Society by contributions from Dr. Bryan's friends, former students, professional associates, and others who subscribe to the principle of the award. A three-year period is planned for the raising of sufficient funds to provide for an adequate cash stipend. It is understood that all contributions to the fund are deductible from taxable income. Contributions and pledges to the fund are now being solicited, and may be sent directly to the Geological Society of America, 419 W. 117th St., New York 27, specifically earmarked for the Bryan Memorial Fund. Other correspondence regarding the award may be addressed to the undersigned.

H. T. U. SMITH
Geology Department, University of Kansas

Mortality and Regression of Sarcoma 180

THE Crocker Mouse Sarcoma 180 has been an excellent transplantable tumor for experimental studies for the past 37 years. Recently many small tumor screening laboratories have been set up to test compounds for antitumor activity. Some of the investigators who are new in the field of transplantable tumor work say that Sarcoma 180 has frequently regressed in their animal experiments.

During the past year, I have transplanted Sarcoma 180 into 5–10 mice at a time in order to study the regression and mortality rate. Table 1 gives a summary of the results obtained.

TABLE 1

MORTALITY AND REGRESSION OF SARCOMA 180

Death day	< 7	7–10	11–4	15–18	19–22	23–28	23–39	Total
Died	9*	16	35	30	41	9	5	145
Regressed	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	5

* These animals were infected or sick prior to being trocared.

The following suggestions are made to investigators who experience regressions with mouse Sarcoma 180:

1. The ideal weight of mice for therapeutic work is 18–22 g. Mice over 25 g in weight tend to have a slower rate of tumor growth.
2. Male mice over 5 weeks old from different cages should not be mixed, since adult males will always fight. This results in poor tumor growth, and at the same time the tumor can become contaminated from the bites of other mice.
3. Female mice are preferred, as they can be mixed with others from various cages without fighting. Pregnant females tend to have a poor tumor growth, and regressions are possible.
4. Tumor that is to be implanted should be cultured at the time of each passage. Contaminated tumors often regress.
5. Crystallized penicillin 1000 u/ml in saline solution prevents infection and also keeps the tumor moist. Streptomycin 0.01 g/ml may also be added if desired. Neither antibiotic inhibits tumor growth.
6. The larger the piece trocared, the larger the resulting tumor growth.

JOSEPH PATTI
Presbyterian Hospital
Newark, New Jersey

Stable Nomenclature

THE demand for stability in nomenclature is a manifestation of the common yearning to maintain the *status quo*. Yet it is heard from scientists, who, of all people, should know that change is the universal rule. Mere opposition to change cannot long command respect, but is there any more valid reason for urging the stabilization of the technical names of organisms? Commonly, the underlying assumption is that if a name can be preserved in form its meaning will always be the same; but that is where hope has led judgment astray.

Taxonomy is a developing science; new characters, significant in classification, are constantly being discovered; changes occur because of alteration in views as to what a genus or a species is; and, on the whole, the concepts of today are not those of 10 or 50 years ago, much less those of 200 years ago when the foundations of present-day nomenclature were being laid.

To illustrate: In 1913 W. W. Eggleston said of *Crataegus*, "About 300 species [recognized by him] . . . The genus has been of great taxonomic interest for ten years, about 1000 species having been de-