

The order of magnitude of the corresponding number of triplets, of any possible type, is

$$\frac{x}{(\log x)^3}$$

and so on generally. Further, we can assign the relative frequencies of pairs or triplets of different types; there are, for example, about twice as many pairs the difference of which is 6 as there are pairs with the difference 2. All these results have been tested by actual enumeration from the factor tables of the first million numbers; and a physicist would probably regard them as proved, though we of course know very well that they are not.

There is a great deal of mathematics the purport of which is quite impossible for any amateur to grasp, and which, however beautiful and important it may be, must always remain the possession of a narrow circle

of experts. It is the peculiarity of the theory of numbers that much of it could be published broadcast, and would win new readers for the *Daily Mail*. The positive integers do not lie, like the logical foundations of mathematics, in the scarcely visible distance, nor in the uncomfortably tangled foreground, like the immediate data of the physical world, but at a decent middle distance, where the outlines are clear and yet some element of mystery remains. There is no one so blind that he does not see them, and no one so sharp-sighted that his vision does not fail; they stand there a continual and inevitable challenge to the curiosity of every healthy mind. I have merely directed your attention for a moment to a few of the less immediately conspicuous features of the landscape, in the hope that I may sharpen your curiosity a little, and that some may feel tempted to walk a little nearer and take a closer view.

### The Organisation of Research.<sup>1</sup>

By Principal J. C. IRVINE, C.B.E., D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S.

THE British Association was the product of an age rather than the inspiration of any one man, yet of those who first gave practical effect to the movement which has spread scientific learning and has bound its devotees in a goodly fellowship there was no more eager spirit than Sir David Brewster. It is not an exaggerated claim that it was he who founded the British Association. One may trace his enlightened action to a desire to combat the apathy and distrust shown by the Government of his day towards scientific work and even scientific workers. Only in the historical sense can I claim any relationship with Brewster. It is my privilege to occupy the Principalship he once held, and I cannot escape from the thought that the daily tasks now mine were once his.

It is thus inevitable that to-day a name often in my mind should spring once more into recollection, especially as my distinguished predecessor was present at the first Hull meeting in 1853, when he contributed two papers to Section A. Chemists should be among the first to pay grateful tribute to Brewster's efforts on behalf of science, and I propose, therefore, to include in my address a review of the position scientific chemistry has won since his day in public and official estimation. Moreover, at the express suggestion of some of our members whose opinions cannot be disregarded, I am induced to add the consideration of the new responsibilities chemists have incurred now that so many of Brewster's hopes have been realised. These were recently submitted by me to another audience and, through the medium of an article in *NATURE* (July 22, p. 131), are possibly known to you already, but I agree with my advisers that their importance warrants further elaboration and wider discussion.

It would be idle to recall the lowly position of chemistry as an educative force in this country, or to reconstruct the difficulties with which the scientific chemist was confronted during the first thirty years of the nineteenth century. Present difficulties are

serious enough, and press for all our attention, without dwelling unduly on troubles of the past. But we must at least remember that in the early days of the British Association "schools" of chemistry were in their infancy, and that systematic instruction in the science was difficult to obtain. Another point of fundamental importance which has to be borne in mind is that the masters of the subject were then for the most part solitary workers.

It is difficult for us, looking back through the years, to realise what it must have meant to search for truth under conditions which were discouraging, if not actually hostile. Yet, although his labours were often thankless and unrewarded, the chemist of the time was probably a riper philosopher and a finer enthusiast than his successor of to-day. He pursued his inquiries amid fewer distractions, and in many ways his lot must have been happy, save when tormented by the thought that a subject so potent as chemistry in developing the intellectual and material welfare of the community should remain neglected to an extent which to us seems incredible.

Public sympathy was lacking, Government support was negligible or grudgingly bestowed, and there was little or no co-operation between scientific chemistry and industry. As an unaided enthusiast the chemist was left to pursue his way without the stimulus, now happily ours, which comes from the feeling that work is supported by educated and enlightened appreciation.

Let me quote from one of Faraday's letters now in my possession and, so far as I can trace, unpublished. Writing to a friend immediately before the foundation of the British Association, he relates that a manufacturer had adopted a process developed in the course of an investigation carried out in the Royal Institution. The letter continues: "He" (the manufacturer) "writes me word that, having repeated our experiments, he finds the product very good, and as our information was given openly to the world he, as a matter of compliment, has presented me with some pairs of razors to give away." If ever there was a compliment

<sup>1</sup> From Part I. of the presidential address delivered to Section B (Chemistry) of the British Association at Hull on Sept. 7.

which could be described as empty, surely this was one; yet the letter gives the impression that Faraday himself was quite content with his reward.

It is perhaps unfair to quote Faraday as a type, for few men are blessed with his transparent simplicity of character, but there is obviously a great gulf fixed between the present day and a time when a debt of honour could be cancelled in such a manner. A little reflection will show that the British Association has played a useful part in discrediting the idea that because so much scientific discovery is given "openly to the world," those who profit by such discoveries should be absolved from their reasonable obligations. Even where scientific workers do not expect or desire personal reward, the institutions which provide them with their facilities are often sorely in need. The recognition, not yet complete, but more adequate than once was the case, that the labourer is worthy of his hire, represents only one minor change which the years have brought.

An even greater contrast, embodying more important principles, is found in the changed attitude of the State towards scientific education and discovery. Remember Brewster's fond hope that, by means of our Association, the whole status of science would be raised, and that a greater measure of support and encouragement would be received from the Government. How eagerly the venerable physicist must have listened to the Presidential Address delivered at the twenty-third meeting of the Association assembled in Hull for the first time. It dealt with many problems familiar to him. No doubt he followed with keen interest the account of the observations on nebulae made with Lord Rosse's telescope, and appreciated the references to the work of Joule and Thomson. The address was a masterly synopsis of scientific progress, but from time to time a new note steals in. There is a significant reference to a consultation with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, another to a conversation with Mr. Gladstone, and a third to a working arrangement concluded with the Admiralty. These would fall sweetly on Brewster's ear, and he would cordially approve of the report of our Parliamentary Committee, which had established sympathetic contact with the House of Commons. He could not fail to be impressed with the changes a few years had brought.

Let us bridge the further gap of sixty-nine years which separates us from that day. The contrast is amazing, and once more we can trace the steady, persistent influence of the British Association in bringing about what is practically a revolution in public and official opinion. We have learned many lessons. The change has come suddenly, but it was not spontaneous. Many years had to be spent in disseminating the idea that research is a vital necessity, and toward this end presidents of our Association have not hesitated, year after year, to add the weight of their influence and eloquence. It was courageous of them to do so. I would refer you particularly to the forcible appeals made by Sir James Dewar at Belfast and Sir Norman Lockyer at Southport, when the plea for more research was laid before the Association, and thus found its way by the most direct channel to the press and to the public. No doubt many other factors have played a part in creating a research atmosphere in this country, but the steady pressure exerted by the

British Association is not the least important of these influences.

The principles of science are to-day widely spread; systematic scientific training has found an honourable place in the schools and in the colleges; above all, there is the realisation that much of human progress is based on scientific inquiry, and at last this is fostered and, in part, financed as a definite unit of national educational policy. Public funds are devoted to provide facilities for those who are competent to pursue scientific investigations, and in this way the State, acting through the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, has assumed the double responsibility of providing for the advancement of knowledge and for the application of scientific methods to industry. Scientific workers have been given the opportunities they desired, and it remains for us to justify all that has been done. We have to-day glanced briefly at the painful toil and long years of preparation; now it falls to us to sow the first crop and reap the first harvest.

Thanks to the wisdom and foresight of others, it has been possible to frame the Government policy in the light of the experience gained with pre-existing research organisations. The pioneer scheme of the kind is that administered by the Commissioners of the 1851 Exhibition, who since 1890 have awarded research scholarships to selected graduates. When in 1901 Mr. Carnegie's benefaction was applied to the Scottish Universities the trustees wisely determined to devote part of the revenues to the provision of research awards which take the form of scholarships, fellowships, and research lectureships. These have proved an immense boon to Scottish graduates, and the success of the venture is sufficiently testified by the fact that the Government research scheme was largely modelled on that of the Carnegie Trust.

In each of these organisations chemistry bulks largely, and the future of our subject is intimately connected with their success or failure. The issue lies largely in our hands. We must not forget that we are only at the beginning of a great movement, and that fresh duties now devolve upon us. It was my privilege for some years to direct the work of a chemistry institute, where research was organised on lines which the operation of the Government scheme will make general. If, from the very nature of things, my experience cannot be lengthy it is at least intimate, and I may perhaps be allowed to lay before you my impressions of the problems we have to face.

Two main objectives lie before us: the expansion of useful learning and the diffusion of research experience among a selected class. This class in itself will form a new unit in the scientific community, and from it will emerge the "exceptional man" to whom, quoting Sir James Dewar, "we owe our reputation and no small part of our prosperity." When these words were uttered in 1902 it was a true saying that "for such men we have to wait upon the will of Heaven." It is still true, but there is no longer the same risk that the exceptional man will fall by the way through lack of means. Many types of the exceptional man will be forthcoming, and you must not imagine that I am regarding him merely as one who will occupy a university chair. He will be found more frequently in industry, where his function will

be to hand on the ideas inspired by his genius to the ordinary investigator.

I have no intention of wearying you by elaborating my views on the training required to produce these different types. My task is greatly simplified if you will agree that the first step must be systematic experience in pure and disinterested research, without any reference to the more complicated problems of applied science. This is necessary, for if our technical research is to progress on sound lines the foundations must be truly laid. I have no doubt as to the prosperity of scientific industries in this country so long as we avoid hasty and premature specialisation in those who control them. We may take it that in the future the great majority of expert chemists will pass through a stage in which they make their first acquaintance with the methods of research under supervision and guidance. The movement is already in progress. The Government grants are awarded generously and widely. The conditions attached are moderate and reasonable, and there is a rush to chemical research in our colleges. Here, then, I issue my first note of warning, and it is to the professors. It is an easy matter to nominate a research student; a research laboratory comfortably filled with workers is an inspiring sight, but there are few more harassing duties than those which involve the direction of young research chemists. No matter how great their enthusiasm and abilities, these pupils have to be trained, guided, inspired, and this help can come only from the man of mature years and experience. I am well aware that scorn has been poured on the idea that research requires training. No doubt the word is an expression of intellectual freedom, but I have seen too many good investigators spoiled and discouraged through lack of this help to hold any other opinion than that training is necessary. I remember, too, years when I wandered more or less aimlessly down the by-paths of pointless inquiries, and I then learned to realise the necessity of economising the time and effort of others.

The duties of such a supervisor cannot be light. He must possess versatility; for although a "research school" will doubtless preserve one particular type of problem as its main feature, there must be a sufficient variety of topics if narrow specialisation is to be avoided. Remember, also, that there can be no formal course of instruction suitable for groups of students, no common course applicable to all pupils and all inquiries. Individual attention is the first necessity, and the educative value of early researches is largely derived from the daily consultations at the laboratory bench or in the library. The responsibility of becoming a research supervisor is great, and, even with the best of good will, many find it difficult to enter sympathetically into the mental position of the beginner. An unexpected result is obtained, an analysis fails to agree, and the supervisor, out of his long experience, can explain the anomaly at once, and generally does so. If the pupil is to derive any real benefit from his difficulties, his adviser must for the moment place himself in the position of one equally puzzled, and must lead his collaborator to sum up the evidence and arrive at the correct conclusion for himself. The policy thus outlined is, I believe, sound, but it makes severe demands on patience, sympathy, and, above all, time.

Research supervision, if conscientiously given, involves the complete absorption of the director's energy and leisure. There is a rich reward in seeing pupils develop as independent thinkers and workers, but the supervisor has to pay the price of seeing his own research output fade away. He will have more conjoint papers, but fewer individual publications, and limitations will be placed on the nature of his work by the restricted technique of his pupils.

I have defined a high standard, almost an ideal, but there is, of course, the easy alternative to use the technical skill of the graduate to carry out the more laborious and mechanical parts of one's own researches, to regard these young workers as so many extra pairs of hands. I need not elaborate the outcome of such a policy.

There is another temptation, and that, in an institution of university rank, is for the professor to leave research training in the hands of his lecturers, selecting as his collaborators only those workers who have passed the apprenticeship stage. This, I am convinced, is a mistake. Nothing consolidates a research school more firmly than the feeling that all who labour in its interests are recognised by having assigned to them collaborators of real ability.

I am not yet done with the professor and his staff, for they will have other matters to attend to if research schools are to justify their existence and to do more than add to the bulk of our journals. In many cases it will be found that the most gifted of the young workers under their care lack what, for want of a better expression, is known as "general culture." Remember, these graduates have just emerged from a period of intensive study in which chemistry and the allied sciences have absorbed most of their attention. For their own sake and in the interests of our subject, they must be protected from the criticism that a scientific education is limited in outlook and leads to a narrow specialism. The research years are plastic years, and many opportunities may be found in the course of the daily consultations "to impress upon the student that there is literature other than the records of scientific papers, and music beyond the range of student songs." I mention only two of the many things which may be added to elevate and refine the research student's life. Others will at once occur to you, but I turn to an entirely different feature of research training, for which I make a special plea: I refer to the inculcation of business-like methods. You will not accuse me, I hope, of departing from the spirit of scholarship or of descending into petty detail, but my experience has been that research students require firm handling. Emancipated as they are from the restrictions of undergraduate study, the idea seems to prevail that these workers ought to be excused the rules which usually govern a teaching laboratory, and may therefore work in any manner they choose. It requires, in fact, the force of a personal example to demonstrate to them that research work can be carried out with all the neatness and care demanded by quantitative analysis. Again, in the exercise of their new freedom young collaborators are inclined to neglect recording their results in a manner which secures a permanent record and is of use to the senior collaborator. As a rule, the compilation of results for publication is not

done by the experimenter, and a somewhat elaborate system of records has to be devised. It should be possible, twenty years after the work has been done, to quote the reasons which led to the initiation of each experiment, and to trace the source and history of each specimen analysed, or upon which standard physical constants have been determined. I need not enter into detail in this connexion beyond stating that, although a system which secures these objects has for many years been adopted in St. Andrews, constant effort is required to maintain the standard.

One of the greatest anxieties of the research supervisor is, however, the avoidance of extravagance and waste. The student is sometimes inclined to assume a lordly attitude and to regard such matters as the systematic recovery of solvents beneath his notice. My view is that, as a matter of discipline as much as in the interests of economy, extravagant working should not be tolerated. There is naturally an economic limit where the time spent in such economics exceeds in value the materials saved, and a correct balance must be adjusted. It is often instructive to lay before a research worker an estimate of the cost of an investigation in which these factors of time and material are taken into account. As a general rule it will be found that the saving of material is of greater moment than the loss of time. The point may not be vitally important in the academic laboratory, but in the factory, to which most of these workers eventually migrate, they will soon have the lesson thrust upon them that their time and salary bear a small proportion to costs of production.

You will see I have changed my warning from the professor to the student. A student generation is short. In a few years, when almost as a matter of course the best of young chemists will qualify for the Doctor of Philosophy degree, it will be forgotten that these facilities have come to us, not as a right, but as a privilege. Those who reap the advantages of these privileges must prove that the efforts made on their behalf have been worth while.

Looking at the position broadly, if one may criticise the research schemes of to-day, it is in the sense that the main bulk of support is afforded to the research apprentice, and the situation has become infinitely harder for the supervisor in that new and onerous tasks are imposed upon him. To expect him to undertake his normal duties and, as a voluntary act, the additional burden of research training is to force him into the devastation of late hours and overwork. The question is at once raised—Are we using our mature research material to the best advantage, and is our policy sufficiently focussed on the requirements of the experienced investigator? I think it will generally be agreed that members of the professor or lecturer class who join in the movement must be relieved in great measure of teaching and administrative work. I am decidedly of the opinion that the research supervisor must be a teacher, and must mingle freely with undergraduates, so as to recognise at the earliest possible stage the potential investigators of the future and guide their studies. To meet this necessity universities and colleges must realise that their curriculum has been extended and that staffs must be

enlarged accordingly. There could then be definite periods of freedom from official duties for those who undertake research training as an added task. Opportunities must also be given to these "exceptional men" to travel occasionally to other centres and refresh themselves in the company of kindred workers. It is evident that our universities are called upon to share the financial burden involved in a national research scheme to a much greater extent than possibly they know.

I may perhaps summarise some of the conclusions reached in thinking over these questions. The first and most important is that in each institution there should be a Board or Standing Committee entrusted with the supervision of research. The functions of such a body would be widely varied and would include:—

1. The allocation of money voted specifically from university or college funds for research expenses.
2. The power to recommend additions to the teaching staff in departments actively engaged in research.
3. The recommendation of promotions on the basis of research achievement.
4. The supervision of regulations governing higher degrees.

Among the more specific problems which confront this Board are the following:—

1. The creation of research libraries where reference works can be consulted immediately.
2. The provision of publication grants, so that where no periodical literature is available the work will not remain buried or obscure.
3. The allocation of travelling grants to enable workers to visit libraries, to inspect manufacturing processes, and to attend the meetings of scientific societies.

There is one thing which a Research Board should avoid. It is, I am convinced, a mistake for a governing body to call for an annual list of publications from research laboratories. Nothing could be more injurious to the true atmosphere of research than the feeling of pressure that papers must be published or the Department will be discredited.

What I have said so far may seem largely a recital of new difficulties, but they are not insurmountable, and to overcome them adds a zest to life. It would have taken too long to go more fully into details, and I have tried to avoid making my address a research syllabus, merely giving in general terms the impressions gained during the twenty years in which the St. Andrews Research Laboratories have been in existence.

I have confined myself to the first stage in the research development of the chemist. His future path may lead him either to the factory or to the lecture-room, and in the end the exceptional man will be found in the director's laboratory or in the professor's chair. However difficult these roads may prove, I feel that with the financial aid now available, supported by the self-sacrificing labours of those who devote themselves to furthering this work, he has the opportunity to reach the goal. It is the beginning of a new scientific age, and we may look forward confidently to the time when there will be no lack of trained scientific intellects to lead our policy and direct our efforts in all that concerns the welfare of the country.