

SCIENCE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1912

THE NATURE OF HEAT¹

CONTENTS

<i>The British Association for the Advancement of Science:—</i>	
<i>The Nature of Heat: PROFESSOR H. L. CALLENDAR</i>	321
<i>The Problem of Mechanical Flight: PROFESSOR G. O. JAMES</i>	336
<i>Early Man in South America</i>	340
<i>The New Allegheny Observatory</i>	341
<i>Scientific Notes and News</i>	341
<i>University and Educational News</i>	344
<i>Discussion and Correspondence:—</i>	
<i>A Remedy Worse than the Disease: DR. WM. H. DALL</i>	344
<i>Scientific Books:—</i>	
<i>Stanley Hall's Founders of Modern Psychology: PROFESSOR E. B. TITCHENER. Cohnheim on Enzymes: PROFESSOR GRAHAM LUSK</i>	346
<i>Special Articles:—</i>	
<i>Symptomatic Development of Cancer: THE LATE DR. W J MCGEE. Reversible Changes in Permeability produced by Electrolytes: PROFESSOR W. J. V. OSTERHOUT</i>	348

MSS. intended for publication and books, etc., intended for review should be sent to the Editor of SCIENCE, Garrison-on-Hudson, N. Y.

I PROPOSE to consider on the present occasion some of our fundamental ideas with regard to the nature of heat, and in particular to suggest that we might with advantage import into our modern theory some of the ideas of the old caloric or material theory which has for so long a time been forgotten and discredited. In so doing I may appear to many of you to be taking a retrograde step, because the caloric theory is generally represented as being fundamentally opposed to the kinetic theory and to the law of the conservation of energy. I would, therefore, remark at the outset that this is not necessarily the case, provided that the theory is rightly interpreted and applied in accordance with experiment. Mistakes have been made on both theories, but the method commonly adopted of selecting all the mistakes made in the application of the caloric theory and contrasting them with the correct deductions from the kinetic theory has created an erroneous impression that there is something fundamentally wrong about the caloric theory, and that it is in the nature of things incapable of correctly representing the facts. I shall endeavor to show that this fictitious antagonism between the two theories is without real foundation. They should rather be regarded as different ways of describing the same phenomena. Neither is complete without the other. The kinetic theory is generally preferable for elementary exposition, and has come to

¹Address of the president to the Mathematical and Physical Science Section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Dundee, 1912. The introductory remarks have been omitted.