helium atom will not account for the observed ionization potentials of that element.

EDWIN C. KEMBLE
JEFFERSON PHYSICAL LABORATORY,
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

REPRINTS FROM SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS

THE librarian is not alone, I imagine, in considering the bound scientific reprints issued as contributions from a given laboratory, most difficult to handle. There should really be no place for articles already published to appear except as reprinted separates. Without doubt, a bound volume of the publications of an institution serves as a report of the work done. But a list of the authors and titles of papers with the place and time of publication would serve this purpose just as well or better. Certain universities issue such lists of the publications of their staffs, and give these lists under the different departmental heads. This seems eminently worth while even where the number of publications in a department is scant.

The department of physiology of one university and the department of botany in another send to this library serial lists of their publications and with the lists the separates themselves, placed in order in a folder. This seems as nearly a perfect method as can be devised. The lists may be filed in any convenient way and the separates dealt with according to the method found most useful to the recipient. The expense of binding is saved to the institution issuing these separates, and while the distribution of the separates may be selective, the printed lists can be given a wide publicity. Such lists if issued very generally would make useful bibliographies and could be systematically filed. At the same time, the departmental library, so important in these days of disappearing private libraries, would have to handle a given article but twice, the original in journal form and the separate.

PRISCILLA B. MONTGOMERY
ASSISTANT LIBRARIAN,
MARINE BIOLOGICAL LABORATORY,
WOODS HOLE, MASS.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS OF RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: Dr. Erwin F. Smith may have performed a service to the plant pathologists in publishing his "Introduction to bacterial diseases of plants," as I have no doubt he has; but he has surely performed a service to scientists everywhere, of every denomination, in publishing the last chapter of that book, "Part V. General Observations." In this he has collected the results of observation in the realms of the literature of science, the scientific method, the life of science and the science of life, all of which really does not express the material he has there collected. A catalogue of the headings the author has used will be more revealing. Here they are:

On subsidiary studies
On seeing things
On experimentation
On beginning work thoughtlessly
On interpretation of phenomena
On repetition of experiments—other people's, one's own
On publication
On clearness in presentation
On brevity of statement—when brevity is not desirable
On the ethics of research
On keeping one's own counsel
On team work
On sharing credits
On attending meetings and keeping up membership in societies, and on being generally public-spirited and helpful in science
On rest and recreation

The student of science will find here counsel of the greatest value on such a subject as the preparation of a paper. Would that I might quote all that he says! "Many a big book could have been boiled down to a few chapters, and in some cases to a few sentences, or to nothing at all, had its author been possessed of *clear ideas*." "Easy writing is hard reading." ". . . it is your solemn duty to sum up the substance of your contribution in a series of brief conclusions which everyone will read, and which, if well put, may induce many to turn back and read your whole

paper." "Either journals should publish no abstracts whatever, or else exact, useful ones." "... before you have gone very deep into any subject search out the literature of it and prepare a proper bibliography."

These are some aphorisms that strike one who is interested in the literary side of science. Ethics and philosophy as Dr. Smith relates them to science are equally intriguing. The value of this chapter, which appears unassumingly at the end of the book, is such that the attention of every student of science is earnestly invited to it.

Frank Place, Jr.

THE DIRECTORSHIP OF THE MAINE AGRICULTURAL STATION

The Maine Agricultural Experiment Station is by act of legislature created as a department of the University of Maine. Its governing board is the trustees of the university. The director reports to the president of the university. The heads of the station departments report to the director. At the reorganization of the station in 1888 the trustees created a representative body to be called the station council for "the development and management of the station."

By act of legislature the experiment station was directed to conduct investigations into animal husbandry. The prime object was to try to learn how milk production and milk fat production are inherited. As one part of this work a herd made up of reciprocal crosses of high and low producing cows was essential. Such a herd was developed at the university in cooperation with the College of Agriculture. In November, 1919, without consultation with the station staff or the station council the trustees ordered this investigation stopped and the animals making up the herd sold. In January, 1920, after station council action, a committee from that body waited upon the trustees and presented a plan for continuing this investigation at Highmoor Farm. This plan was unanimously approved by the trustees. Among the items approved and as taken from the trustees records of that meeting is "The plan includes the use of certain barn space at the farm and the construction of an additional barn for housing, and water supply and equipment for caring for the animals and their products." Acting under this authority the council committee and the station director immediately took steps to put this action into effect. A barn was erected, the old barn remodeled, a well drilled and equipment purchased. The building of the barn was inspected in June when it was about half completed by a committee of the trustees who were appointed by the board with full authority relative to the new construction at Highmoor Farm. The committee from the station council met with the committee from the trustees. Neither at that time nor at any time while the construction was in progress did the trustees make any suggestion as to change or modification of the trustee action of January, 1920.

November 29 without previous notice the director of the station was requested by telephone to go to Bangor to meet the board of trustees. When he appeared he was told by the president of the board that the trustees unanimously demanded his immediate resignation. On asking why, the director was informed that by building a barn at Highmoor Farm he had exceeded his authority. The director denied that he had exceeded authority and cited the paragraph from the trustee records above quoted. He refused to resign. At about 10 o'clock the morning of November 30 he received a notice signed by the clerk of the board of trustees notifying him that the trustees had removed him from being director, the removal to be effective December 1. The director spent the remainder of the 30th putting station matters in the best shape possible for leaving in the limited time. As the trustees had delegated no one to take his place and as they had ignored the president of the university in the matter by sending the communication of removal direct to the director, the director suggested to the heads of the station that they should continue to act automatically in station management as they would were the director temporarily absent. And there the matter now rests.