SCIENCE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1915

CONTENTS

MSS. intended for publication and books, etc., intended for review should be sent to Professor J. McKeen Cattell, Garrison-on-Hudson, N. Y.

THE PHYSIOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE OF PHASE BOUNDARIES[1]

EVEN a hasty consideration of the arrangements present in living cells is sufficient to bring conviction that the physical and chemical systems concerned operate under conditions very different from those of reactions taking place between substances in true solution. We become aware of the fact that there are numerous constituents of the cell which do not mix with one another. In other words, the cell system is one of many "phases," to use the expression introduced by Willard Gibbs.

Further, parts of this system which appear homogeneous under the ordinary microscope are shown by the ultra-microscope to be themselves heterogeneous. These are in what is known as the colloidal state. Some dispute has taken place as to whether this state is properly to be called a heterogeneous one, but it is sufficient for our purpose to note that investigation shows that the interfaces of contact between the components of such systems are the seat of the various forms of energy which we meet with in the case of systems obviously consisting of phases which can be separated mechanically, so that considerations applying to coarsely heterogeneous systems apply also to colloidal systems. Although the phases of a colloidal system can not be so obviously and easily separated as those of an ordinary heterogeneous one, this can be done almost completely by filtration through membranes such as the gelatin in

---

[1] Address of the President of the Section of Physiology at the Manchester Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science.

Martin's process. To avoid confusion, however, it has been suggested that the colloidal state should be spoken of as "microheterogeneous." There are, in fact, certain phenomena more or less peculiar to the colloidal state and due to the influence of the sharp curvature of the surfaces of the minutely subdivided phase. The effect of this curvature is a considerable pressure in the interior of the phase, owing to the surface tension, and it adds further complexity to the properties manifested by it.

We see, then, that the chemical reactions of chief importance to us as physiologists are those known as "heterogeneous." This class of reactions, until comparatively recent times, has been somewhat neglected by the pure chemist.

In some of its aspects, the problem before us was discussed by one of my predecessors, Professor Hopkins, as also by Professor Macallum, but its importance will, I think, warrant my asking your indulgence for a further brief discussion. Permit me first to apologize for what may seem to some of those present to be an unnecessarily elementary treatment of certain points.

It is easy to realize that the molecules which are situated at the interface where two phases are in contact are subject to forces differing from those to which the molecules in the interior of either phase are subject. Consider one phase only, the molecules at its surface are exposed on the one side to the influence of similar molecules; on the other side, they are exposed to the influence of molecules of a nature chemically unlike their own or in a different physical state of aggregation. The result of such asymmetric forces is that the phase boundary is the seat of various forms of energy not present in the interior of the phase. The most obvious of these is the surface energy due to the state of tension existing where a liquid or a gas forms one of the phases. It would lead us too far to discuss the mode of origin of this surface tension, except to call to mind that it is due to the attractive force of the molecules for one another, a force which is left partially unbalanced at the surface, so that the molecules here are pulled inwards. The tension is, of course, only the intensity factor of the surface energy, the capacity factor being the area of the surface. We see at once that any influence which alters the area of the surface alters also the magnitude of that form of energy of which we are speaking.

This is not the only way in which the properties of substances are changed at phase boundaries. The compressibility of a solvent, such as water, are altered, so that the solubilities of various substances in it are not the same as in the interior of the liquid phase. It is stated by J. J. Thomson that potassium sulphate is 60 per cent. more soluble in the surface film. The ways in which the properties of a solvent are changed are sometimes spoken of as "lyotropic," and they play an important part in the behavior of colloids. We meet also with the presence of electrical charges, of positive or negative sign. These are due, as a rule, to electrolytic dissociation of the surface of one phase, in which the one ion, owing to its insolubility, remains fixed at the surface, while the opposite ion, although soluble, can not wander away further than permitted by electrostatic attraction. Thus we have a Helmholtz double layer produced.

Before we pass on to consider how these phenomena intervene in physiological processes, there is one fact that should be referred to on account of its significance in connection with the contractile force of muscle. Surface tension is found to *decrease* as the temperature rises, or, as it is sometimes put, it has a negative temperature coefficient. This is unusual; but, if we remember that the interface between a liquid and its vapor disappears when the temperature rises to the critical point, and with it, of course, all phenomena at the boundary surface, the fact is not surprising that there is a diminution of these phenomena as the critical temperature is approached.

Perhaps that result of surface energy known as "adsorption" is the one in which the conditions present at phase boundaries make themselves most frequently obvious. Since the name has been used somewhat loosely, it is a matter of some consequence to have clear ideas of what is meant when it is made use of. Unless it is used to describe a definite fact, it can only be mischievous to the progress of science.

Permit me, then, first to remind you of that fact of universal experience, known as the "dissipation of energy," which is involved in the second law of energetics. Free energy—that is, energy which can be used for the performance of useful work—is invariably found to diminish, if the conditions are such that this is possible. If we have, therefore, a system in which, by any change of distribution of the constituents, free energy can be decreased, such a change of distribution will take place. This is one form of the well-known "Principle of Carnot and Clausius."

Now, practically any substance dissolved in water lowers the surface tension present at the interface between the liquid and another solid or liquid phase with which it is in contact. Moreover, up to a certain limit, the magnitude of this effect is in proportion to the concentration of the solute. Therefore, as was first pointed out by Willard Gibbs, concentration of a solute at an interface has the effect of reducing free energy and will therefore occur. This is adsorption. As an example, we may take the deposition of a dyestuff on the surface of charcoal, from which it can be removed again, unaltered, by appropriate means, such as extraction with alcohol. Charcoal plus dye may, if any satisfaction is derived from the statement, be called a compound. But, since its chemical composition depends on the concentration of the solution in which it was formed, it is much more accurate to qualify the statement by calling it an "adsorption-compound." Moreover, the suggestion that the union is a chemical one tends to deprive the conception of chemical combination of its characteristic quality, namely, the change of properties. Dye-stuff and charcoal are chemically unchanged by adsorption.

The origin of adsorption from surface tension is easily able to explain why it is less as the temperature rises, as we find experimentally. As we have just seen, surface tension diminishes with increase of temperature.

Let us next consider what will happen if the liquid phase contains in solution a substance which lowers surface tension and is also capable of entering into chemical reaction with the material of which the other, solid, phase consists. For example, a solution of caproic acid in contact with particles of aluminium hydroxide. On the surface of the solid, the concentration of the acid will be increased by adsorption, and, in consequence, the rate of the reaction with it will be raised, according to the law of mass action. Further, suppose that the liquid phase contains two substances which react slowly with each other, but not with the solid phase. They will be brought into intimate contact with each other on the surface of the solid phase, their concentration raised and the rate of their interaction increased. One of the reagents may clearly be the solvent itself. But in all these cases the rate of the reaction can not be expressed by a simple application of the law of mass action, since the active masses are not functions of the molecular concentrations, but of the surface of the phase boundaries. The application of these considerations to the problem of the action of enzymes and of heterogeneous catalysis in general will be apparent. That the action of enzymes is exerted by their surfaces is shown, apart from the fact that they are in colloidal solution, by the results of experiments made in liquids in which the enzymes themselves are insoluble in the usual sense, so that they can be filtered off by ordinary filter paper and the filtrate found to be free from enzyme. Notwithstanding this insolubility, enzymes are still active in these liquids. The statement has been found, up to the present, to apply to lipase, emulsin and urease, probably to trypsin, and the only difficulty in extending it to all enzymes is that of finding a substrate soluble in some liquid in which the enzyme itself is not. That adsorption is a controlling factor in the velocity of enzyme action has been advocated by myself for some years, but it is not to be understood as implying that the whole action of enzymes is an "adsorption phenomenon," whatever may be the meaning of this statement. The rate at which the chemical reaction proceeds is controlled by the mass of the reagents concentrated on the surface of the enzyme phase at any given moment, but the temperature coefficient will, of course, be that of a chemical reaction.

The thought naturally suggests itself, may not the adsorption of the reacting substances on the surface of the enzyme suffice in itself to bring about the equilibrium at a greater rate, so that the assumption of a secondary chemical combination of a chemical nature between enzyme and substrate may be superfluous? I should hesitate somewhat to propose this hypothesis for serious consideration were it not that it was given by Faraday as the explanation of one of the most familiar cases of heterogeneous catalysis, namely, the union of oxygen and hydrogen gases by means of the surfaces of platinum and other substances. The insight shown by Faraday into the nature of the phenomena with which he was concerned is well known and has often caused astonishment. Now, this case of oxygen and hydrogen gases is clearly one of those called "catalytic" by Berzelius. The fact that the agent responsible for the effect did not itself suffer change was clear to Faraday. I would also, in parenthesis, direct attention to the fact that he correctly recognized the gold solutions which he prepared as suspensions of metallic particles —that is, as what we now call colloidal solutions. Although the systematic investigation of colloids, and the name itself, were due to Graham, some of the credit of the discovery should be given to the man who first saw what was their nature. Adsorption, again, was accurately described by Faraday, but without giving it a name.

I confess that there are, at present, difficulties in the way of accepting concentration by adsorption as a complete explanation of the catalytic activities of enzymes. It is not obvious, for example, why the same enzyme should not be able to hydrolyze both maltose and saccharose, as it is usually expressed. Another difficulty is that it is necessary to assume that the relative concentration of the components of the chemical system must be the same on the surface of the enzyme as it is in the body of the solution; in other words, the adsorption of each must be the same function of its concentration. Unless this were so, the equilibrium position on the enzyme surfaces, and therefore in the body of the solution, would be a different one under the action of an enzyme from that arrived at spontaneously or brought about by a homogeneous catalyst such as acid. This consideration was brought to my notice by Professor Hopkins, and requires experimental investigation. We know, indeed, that in some cases there is such a difference in the position of the equilibrium position, for which various explanations have been suggested. But it would be a matter of some interest to know whether this difference has any relation to different degrees of adsorption of the components of the system.

At the same time, adsorption is under the control of so many factors, surface tension, electrical charge, and so on, that the possibilities seem innumerable. There are, moreover, two considerations to which I may be allowed to direct your attention. Hardy has pointed out that it is probable that the increased rate of reaction at the interface between phases may be due, not merely to increased concentration as such, but that in the act of concentration itself molecular forces may be brought into play which result in a rise in chemical potential of the reacting substances. In the second place, Barger has shown that the adsorption of iodine by certain organic compounds is clearly related to the chemical composition of the surfaces of these substances, but that this relationship does not result in chemical combination or in abolition of the essential nature of the process as an adsorption. It would appear that those properties of the surface, such as electric charge and so on, which control the degree of adsorption, are dependent on the chemical nature of the surface. This dependence need not cause us any surprise, since the physical properties of a substance, inclusive of surface tension, are so closely related to its chemical composition.

There is one practical conclusion to be derived from the facts already known with regard to enzymes. This is, that any simple application of the law of mass action can not lead to a correct mathematical expression for the rate of reaction, although attempts of this kind have been made, as by Van Slyke. The rate must be proportional to the amount of substrate adsorbed, and this, again, is a function both of the concentration of the substrate and of that of the products. It is, then, a continuously varying quantity. Expressed mathematically, the differential equation for the velocity must be something of this kind:

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = KC^n$$

where n itself is an unknown function of C, the concentration of the substrate or products.

The hypothesis of control by adsorption gives a simple explanation of the exponential ratio between the concentration of the enzyme and its activity, which is found to be different numerically according to the stage of the reaction. At the beginning, it may be nearly unity; in the middle it is more nearly 0.5, as in the so-called "square root law" of Schütz and Borissov, which is, however, merely an approximation. Simple explanations are also given of the fact that increasing the concentration of the substrate above a certain value no longer causes an increased rate of reaction. This is clearly because the active surface is saturated. Again, the effect of antiseptics and other substances which, by their great surface activity, obtain possession of the enzyme surfaces, and thereby exclude to a greater or less degree the adsorption of the substrate, receives a reasonable account. In many cases, the depressant or favoring action of electrolytes, including acid and alkali, is probably due to aggregation or dispersion of the colloidal particles of the enzyme, with decrease or increase of their total surface. It is to be noted that such explanations are independent of any possible formation of an intermediate compound between enzyme and substrate, *after* adsorption has taken place.

There is a further way in which adsorption plays a part in the chemical processes of cells, including those under the influence of catalysts. It is a familiar fact that the concentration of water plays a large part in the position of equilibrium attained in reversible reactions of hydrolysis and synthesis. A synthetic process is brought about by diminution of the effective concentration of water. There are, doubtless, means of doing this in the elaborate mechanisms of cell life, and, in all probability, it is by adsorption on surfaces, which are able to change their "affinity" for water.

I pass on to consider briefly some other cases in which the phenomena at phase boundaries require attention.

Let us turn our gaze from the interior of the cell to the outer surface, at which it is in contact with the surrounding medium. From the nature of adsorption there can be no doubt that, if the cell or the surrounding liquid contains substances which decrease surface energy of any form, these constituents will be concentrated at the interface. There are many such substances to be found in cells, some of lipoid nature, some proteins, and so on. Further, the experiments of Ramsden have shown that a large number of substances are deposited in surface films in a more or less rigid or solidified form. We are thus led to inquire whether these phenomena do not account for the existence of the cell membrane, about which so much discussion has taken place. We find experimentally that there are facts which show that this membrane, under ordinary resting conditions, is impermeable to most crystalloids, including inorganic salts, acids and bases. There is no other explanation of the fact that the salts present in cells are not only in different concentration inside from that outside, but that there may be absence of certain salts from one which are present in the other, as, for example, sodium in the plasma of the rabbit not in the corpuscles. Moreover, the experiments of Hoeber have shown that electrolytes are free in the cells, so that they are not prevented from diffusion by being fixed in any way. The mere assumption of a membrane impermeable to colloids only will not account for the facts, since, as I have shown in another place, this would only explain differences of concentration, but not of composition. The surface concentration of cell constituents readily accounts for the changes of permeability occurring in functional activity, since it depends on the nature of the cell protoplasm, and chemical changes of many and various kinds occur in this system. If such be the nature of the cell membrane, it is evident that we are not justified in expecting to find it composed of lipoid or of protein alone. It must have a very complex composition, varying with the physiological state of the cell. Indeed, complex artificial membranes have been prepared having properties very similar to that of the cell.

This view that the membrane is formed by surface condensation of constituents of the cell readily accounts for the changes of permeability occurring in functional activity, since its composition depends on that of the cell protoplasm, and chemical changes of various kinds take place in this system, as it is scarcely necessary to remind you. In fact, the cell membrane is not to be regarded as an independent entity, but as a working partner, as it were, in the business of the life of the cell. In the state of excitation, for example, there is satisfactory evidence that the cell membrane loses its character of semipermeability to electrolytes, etc. This statement has been shown to apply to muscle, nerve, gland cells, and the excitable tissues of plants, as well as to unicellular organisms. We shall see presently how this fact gives a simple explanation of the electrical changes associated with the state of activity.

If, then, the cell membrane is a part of the cell system as a whole, it is not surprising to find that substances can affect profoundly, although reversibly, the activities of the cell, even when they are unable to pass beyond the outer surface. The state of dynamic equilibrium between the cell membrane and the rest of the cell system is naturally affected by such means, since the changes in the one component involve compensating ones in the other. Interesting examples of such actions are numerous. I may mention the effect of calcium ions on the heart muscle, the effect of sodium hydroxide on oxidation in the eggs of the sea-urchin, and that of acids on the contraction of the jelly-fish. Somewhat puzzling are those cases in which drugs, such as pilocarpine and muscarine, act only during their passage through the membrane and lose their effect when their concentration has become equal inside and outside the cell.

The work of Dale on anaphylaxis leads him to the conclusion that the phenomena shown by sensitized plain muscle can most reasonably be explained by colloidal interaction on the surface of the fibers. The result of this is increased permeability and excitation resulting therefrom.

I referred previously to the electrical change in excitable tissues and its relation to the cell membrane. It was, I believe, first pointed out by Ostwald and confirmed by many subsequent investigators, that in order that a membrane may be impermeable to a salt it is not a necessary condition that it shall be impermeable to both the ions into which this salt is electrolytically dissociated. If impermeable to one only of these ions, the other, diffusible, ion can not pass out beyond the point at which the osmotic pressure due to its kinetic energy balances the electrostatic attraction of the oppositely charged ion, which is imprisoned. There is a Helmholtz double layer formed at the membrane, the outside having a charge of the sign of the diffusible ions, the inside that of the other ions. Now, suppose that we lead off from two places on the surface of a cell having a membrane with such properties to some instrument capable of detecting differences of electrical potential. It will be clear that we shall obtain no indication of the presence of the electrical charge, because the two points are equipotential, and we can not get at the interior of the cell without destroying its structure. But if excitation means increased permeability, the double layer will disappear at an excited spot owing to indiscriminate mixing of both kinds of ions, and we are then practically leading off from the interior of the cell, that is, from the internal component of the double layer, while the unexcited spot is still led off from the outer component. The two contacts are no longer equipotential. Since we find experimentally that a point at rest is electrically positive to an excited one, the outer component must be positive, or the membrane is permeable to certain cations, impermeable to the corresponding anions. Any action on the cell such as would make the membrane permeable, injury, certain chemical agents, and so on, would have the same effect as the state of excitation. If we may assume the possibility of degrees of permeability, the state of inhibition might be produced by *decrease* of permeability of the membrane of a cell, which was previously in a state of excitation owing to some influence inherent in the cell itself or coming from the outside. This manner of accounting for the electromotive changes in cells is practically the same as that given by Bernstein.

It will be found of interest to apply to secretory cells the facts to which I have directed your attention. If we suppose that the setting into play of such cells is associated with the production of some osmotically active substance, together with abolition of the state of semi-permeability of the membrane covering the ends of the cells in relation with the lumen of the alveolus of the gland, it is plain that water would be taken up from the lymph spaces and capillaries and escape to the duct, carrying with it the secretory products of the cells. This process would be continuous so long as osmotically active substances were formed. Such a process has been shown by Lepeshkin to occur in plants, and we have also evidence of increased permeability during secretory activity in the gland cells of animals. From what has been said previously, it is evident that electrical differences would show themselves between the permeable and semipermeable ends of such cells, as has been found to be the case.

As a modifiable structure, we see the importance of such a membrane as that described if it takes part in the formation of the synapse between neurones. The manifold possibilities of allowing passage to states of excitation or inhibition and of being affected by drugs will be obvious without further elaboration on my part.

Enough has already been said, I think, to show the innumerable ways in which phenomena at phase boundaries intervene in physiological events. Indeed, there are very few of these, if any, in which some component or other is not controlled by the action of surfaces of contact. But there is one especially important case to which I may be allowed to devote a few words in conclusion. I refer to the contractile process of muscle. It has become clear, chiefly through the work of Fletcher, Hopkins and A. V. Hill, that what is usually called muscular contraction consists of two parts. Starting from the resting muscle, we find that it must have a store of potential energy, since we can make it do work when stimulated. After being used in this way, the store must be replenished, since energy can not be obtained from nothing. This restoration process is effected by an independent oxidation reaction, in which carbohydrate is burnt up with the setting free of energy which is made use of to restore the muscle to its original state. Confining our attention for the moment to the initial, contractile, stage, the essential fact is the production of a certain amount of energy of tension, which can either be used for the performance of external work or be allowed to become degraded to heat in the muscle itself. It was Blix who first propounded the view that the amount of this energy of tension is related to the magnitude of certain surfaces in the muscle fibers. But the fact was demonstrated in a systematic and quantitative manner by A. V. Hill. He showed, in fact, that the amount of energy set free in the contractile process is directly related to the length of muscle fibers during the development of the state of tension. In other words, the process is a surface phenomenon, not one of volume, and is directly proportional to the area of certain surfaces arranged longitudinally in the muscle. This same relationship has been shown by Patterson and Starling to hold for the ventricular contraction of the mammalian heart and by Kosawa for that of the cold-blooded vertebrate. It appears that all the phenomena connected with the output of blood by the heart can be satisfactorily explained by the hypothesis that the energy of the contraction is regulated by the *length* of the ventricular fibers during the period of development of the contractile stress. The degree of filling at the moment of contraction is thus the determining factor.

That surface tension itself may be responsible for the energy given off in muscular contraction was first suggested by Fitzgerald in 1878, and it seems, from calculations made, that changes at the contact surface of the fibrillæ with the sarcoplasm may be capable of affording a sufficient amount. The difficulties in deciding the question are great, but, in addition to the facts mentioned, there is other interesting evidence at hand. It has been shown, by Gad and Heymans, by Bernstein and others, that the contractile stress produced by a stimulus has a negative temperature coefficient. Within the limits of temperature between which the muscle can be regarded as normal, this stress is the greater the lower the temperature. The same statement was shown by Weizsäcker (working with A. V. Hill) to hold for the heat developed in the contractile stage. Now, of all the forms of energy possibly concerned, that associated with phase boundaries is the only one with a negative temperature coefficient. Another aspect of this relation to temperature is the well-known increase of the tonus of smooth muscle with fall in temperature.

It is tempting to bring into relation with the change in surface tension the production of lactic acid. In fact, this idea was put into a definite statement by Haber and Klemensievich in 1909 in a frequently quoted paper on the forces present at phase boundaries. The production of acid is stated to alter the electrical forces at this situation. This electrical charge involves a change of surface tension, and it is this change of surface tension which brings about the mechanical deformation of the muscle. Mines also has brought forward good evidence that the production of lactic acid is responsible for the change of tension. As to how the lactic acid is set free, and of what nature the system of high potential present in muscle may be, we require much more information. The absence of evolution of carbon dioxide when oxygen is not present shows that no oxidation takes place in the development of tension. There are other difficulties also in supposing that this system present in resting muscle is of a chemical nature. If the energy afforded by the oxidation of carbohydrate in the recovery stage is utilized for the formation of another chemical system with high energy content, the theory of coupled reactions indicates that there must be some component common to both systems. It is difficult to see what component of the muscle system could satisfy the conditions required. On the whole, some kind of system of a more physical nature seems the most probable. If it be correct that the oxidation of substances other than carbohydrate, fat, for example, can afford the chemical energy for muscular contraction, as appears from the results of metabolism experiments, a further difficulty arises in respect to a coupled reaction. But the question still awaits investigation.

On the whole, I think that we may conclude that more study of the phenomena at phase boundaries will throw light on many problems still obscure. It would probably not be going too far to say that the peculiarities of the phenomena called "vital" are due to the fact that they are manifestations of interchange of energy between the phases of heterogeneous systems. It was Clerk Maxwell who compared the transactions of the material universe to mercantile operations in which so much credit is transferred from one place to another, energy being the representative of credit. There are many indications that it is just in this process of change of energy from one form to another that special degrees of activity are to be observed. Such, for example, are the electrical phenomena seen in the oxidation of phosphorus or benzaldehyde, and it appears that, in the photo-chemical system of the green plant, radiant energy is caught on the way, as it were, to its degradation to heat, and utilized for chemical work. In a somewhat similar way, it might be said that money in the process of transfer is more readily diverted, although perhaps not always to such good purpose as in the chloroplast. Again, just as in commerce money that is unemployed is of no value, so it is in physiology. Life is incessant change or transfer of energy, and a system in statical equilibrium is dead.

W. M. Bayliss

University College,
London

THE PUBLICATION OF THE RESULTS OF INVESTIGATIONS MADE IN EXPERIMENT STATIONS IN TECHNICAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS[1]

In order to gain a proper perspective for a consideration of the topic which has been assigned the final place in this discussion of experiment station publications, namely, the publication of results in scientific journals, including the *Journal of Agricultural Research,* it will be necessary to consider very briefly certain historical aspects of the question. Until within the last few years it has been a well-nigh universal practise of the experiment stations in this country to publish all, or very nearly all, of the material which they have had for publication in the form of bulletins. The reason for this practise, which has always seemed anomalous to scientific workers in other than agricultural fields, is of course found in the historical beginnings of station work and station publication in America.

Section 1 of the Hatch Act provides "That in order to aid in acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects connected with agriculture, and to promote scientific investigation of agricultural science," experiment stations were to be established. Further on Section 4 provided "That bulletins or reports of progress shall be published" as often as once in three months, and these distributed to farmers and newspapers.

Now the idea plainly embodied in all this was that the station should issue bulletins in order that the farmers might be informed of the nature and results of its activities. This entirely laudable idea worked well enough at first. Very presently, however, as the character and quality of the station work changed and the stations began in some measure to fulfil the second purpose for which they were organized, namely, to contribute to agricultural knowledge by investigation, it came about that bulletins were sometimes issued which, from the very nature of the case, left the farmer, who had the temerity to tackle reading them, on the whole rather worse informed when he had finished than he was before he began. Something of this sort was bound to be the case as soon as experiment station work was of anything but the most superficial character. Just as soon as there began to be issued in bulletin form really scientific papers, of a technical character, it became evident that the publishing activity of a station must perform two separate and distinct functions, and not merely a single one as was evidently contemplated by those who prepared the Hatch Act.

These two functions are: (1) To inform the general public of the activity of the station, with reference to such matters as it (the public) is actually interested in from the viewpoint of practical farming. In other words, one function of station publication is, in the language of the original act, to diffuse among the people useful and practical information. (2) The second function of station publication is

---

[1] From the Maine Agricultural Experiment Station. This paper formed a part of a symposium on the various forms of station publication at the California meeting of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations in the Station Section. The paper was read by Director Charles D. Woods, in the absence of the author.