not actually be rendering a greater service to science than he would in following the alternative course? Yet there are probably few physicists, engaged in teaching and research, who have more than a passing interest in the possible applications of physics to the other sciences. Perhaps it is only natural that the motive of early results of their work, in the form of publications, should far outweigh the motive of results greater and more lasting, but somewhat intangible and long deferred.

Under existing conditions there is undoubtedly another source of discouragement to the physics instructor who would otherwise gladly develop such a course. This is the tendency on the part of our educational institutions to make advancement in rank and salary depend almost entirely upon productive scholarship, sometimes measured in terms of volume rather than quality. Excellence in teaching and conscientious work upon a course of the kind here advocated would hardly be considered productive. The instructor, in doing such work, would be making a real sacrifice to the cause of science. Few can afford to make sacrifices of this kind.

Whatever the solution of the difficulties which have been pointed out, it will probably be satisfactory and acceptable to our educational institutions only if it comes as the result of cooperation on a large scale among the various sciences. Although the responsibility for making physics available in the manner suggested seems to me to belong to physics, the initiative in demanding of physics the kind of training that is wanted belongs to the other sciences. It is their duty to outline to physics what they need, and after the courses have been made available, to maintain an active interest in rather than a passive attitude towards them. And the common motive must be the vision of the significant but, perhaps, little appreciated contributions, through such efforts, to the advancement of science. To find the answer to the problems which are brought up by this aspect of the problem of properly training our science students seems a task worthy of a body like the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The accomplishment of such a task would give a new and fuller meaning to the name of this great organization.

Paul E. Klopsteg

Leeds & Northrup Company,
Philadelphia, Pa.

SCIENTIFIC EVENTS

THE OHIO COLLEGE AND EXPERIMENT STATION

In 1917 the College of Agriculture of the Ohio State University and the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station entered upon a closer cooperation in their respective fields of work by the appointment of C. G. Williams, chief in agronomy at the station as non-resident professor of farm crops at the college; of Professor J. B. Park and Firman E. Bear, of the college as honorary associates, respectively, in agronomy and soils at the station, and of G. W. Conrey, instructor at the college as assistant in soils at the station. In 1918 Professor Herbert Osborn, of the college, was appointed honorary associate entomologist of the experiment station, and H. A. Gossard, chief in entomology at the station, was appointed non-resident professor of entomology at the college. In March, 1920, C. C. Hayden, chief in dairying at the station was appointed non-resident assistant professor at the college, and Professor Oscar Erf, of the college, was appointed honorary professor in dairying at the station.

In the actual working out of this cooperation the specialists at the experiment station's work by counsel, by lectures at the field meetings held by the station, and by conducting special lines of research which are reported in station bulletins.

The station's field experiments are widely scattered over the state, in order to bring under observation the various soil types and different industries, and these experiments are visited by the higher classes in agriculture at the college.

THE LOUISIANA ENTOMOLOGICAL SOCIETY

At New Orleans a meeting was held on March 5 to discuss the organization of an entomological society or club. The meeting