

SCIENCE

A WEEKLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE, PUBLISHING THE
OFFICIAL NOTICES AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 25, 1905.

CONTENTS.

<i>Address of the President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science:</i> PROFESSOR G. H. DARWIN.....	225
<i>Address to the Mathematical and Physical Section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science:</i> PROFESSOR A. R. FORSYTH	234
<i>Scientific Books:—</i>	
<i>Catalogue of the Lepidoptera Phalaenæ in the British Museum:</i> DR. HARRISON G. DYAR	247
<i>Scientific Journals and Articles,</i>	248
<i>Societies and Academies:—</i>	
<i>Clemson College Science Club:</i> DR. HAVEN METCALF	248
<i>Special Articles.—</i>	
<i>Assortative Mating in Man:</i> DR. FRANK E. LUTZ	249
<i>Current Notes on Meteorology:—</i>	
<i>Progress of Kite and Balloon Meteorology; Meteorological Activity in England; Tropical Cyclones; Climatic Changes in Central Africa; Cotton-growing in Tropical Australia; Hurricanes, Cocoa Trees and Exports of Guam; Exposure and Crops in Switzerland:</i> PROFESSOR R. DEC. WARD...	250
<i>Acta of the International Convention of the International Catalogue of Scientific Literature</i>	252
<i>Scientific Notes and News</i>	253
<i>University and Educational News</i>	256

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

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.¹

I.

BARTHOLOMEU DIAZ, the discoverer of the Cape of Storms, spent sixteen months on his voyage, and the little flotilla of Vasco da Gama, sailing from Lisbon on July 8, 1497, only reached the Cape in the middle of November. These bold men, sailing in their puny fishing-smacks to unknown lands, met the perils of the sea and the attacks of savages with equal courage. How great was the danger of such a voyage may be gathered from the fact that less than half the men who sailed with da Gama lived to return to Lisbon. Four hundred and eight years have passed since that voyage, and a ship of 13,000 tons has just brought us here, in safety and luxury, in but little more than a fortnight.

How striking are the contrasts presented by these events! On the one hand compare the courage, the endurance and the persistence of the early navigators with the little that has been demanded of us; on the other hand consider how much man's power over the forces of nature has been augmented during the past four centuries. The capacity for heroism is probably undiminished, but certainly the occasions are now rarer when it is demanded of us. If we are heroes, at least but few of us ever find it out, and, when we read stories of ancient feats of courage, it is hard to prevent an uneasy thought that, notwithstanding our

¹ Cape Town, August 15, 1905.

boasted mechanical inventions, we are perhaps degenerate descendants of our great predecessors.

Yet the thought that to-day is less romantic and less heroic than yesterday has its consolation, for it means that the lot of man is easier than it was. Mankind, indeed, may be justly proud that this improvement has been 'due to the successive efforts of each generation to add to the heritage of knowledge handed down to it by its predecessors, whereby we have been born to the accumulated endowment of centuries of genius and labor.

I am told that in the United States the phrase 'I want to know' has lost the simple meaning implied by the words, and has become a mere exclamation of surprise. Such a conventional expression could hardly have gained currency except amongst a people who aspire to knowledge. The dominance of the European race in America, Australasia and South Africa has no doubt arisen from many causes, but amongst these perhaps the chief one is that not only do 'we want to know,' but also that we are determined to find out. And now within the last quarter of a century we have welcomed into the ranks of those who 'want to know' an oriental race, which has already proved itself strong in the peaceful arts of knowledge.

I take it, then, that you have invited us because you want to know what is worth knowing; and we are here because we want to know you, to learn what you have to tell us, and to see that South Africa of which we have heard so much.

The hospitality which you are offering us is so lavish, and the journeys which you have organized are so extensive, that the cynical observer might be tempted to describe our meeting as the largest picnic on record. Although we intend to enjoy our picnic with all our hearts, yet I should like

to tell the cynic, if he is here, that perhaps the most important object of these conferences is the opportunity they afford for personal intercourse between men of like minds who live at the remotest corners of the earth.

We shall pass through your land with the speed and the voracity of a flight of locusts; but, unlike the locust, we shall, I hope, leave behind us permanent fertilization in the form of stimulated scientific and educational activity. And this result will ensue whether or not we who have come from Europe are able worthily to sustain the lofty part of prophets of science. We shall try our best to play to your satisfaction on the great stage upon which you call on us to act, and if when we are gone you shall, amongst yourselves, pronounce the performance a poor one, yet the fact will remain, that the meeting has embodied in a material form the desire that the progress of this great continent shall not be merely material; and such an aspiration secures its own fulfilment. However small may be the tangible results of our meeting, we shall always be proud to have been associated with you in your efforts for the advancement of science.

We do not know whether the last hundred years will be regarded forever as the *sæculum mirabile* of discovery, or whether it is but the prelude to yet more marvelous centuries. To us living men, who scarcely pass a year of our lives without witnessing some new marvel of discovery or invention, the rate at which the development of knowledge proceeds is truly astonishing; but from a wider point of view the scale of time is relatively unimportant, for the universe is leisurely in its procedure. Whether the changes which we witness be fast or slow, they form a part of a long sequence of events which begin in some past of immeasurable remoteness and tend

to some end which we can not foresee. It must always be profoundly interesting to the mind of man to trace successive cause and effect in the chain of events which make up the history of the earth and all that lives on it, and to speculate on the origin and future fate of animals, and of planets, suns and stars. I shall try, then, to set forth in my address some of the attempts which have been made to formulate evolutionary speculation. This choice of a subject has, moreover, been almost forced on me by the scope of my own scientific work, and it is, I think, justified by the name which I bear. It will be my fault and your misfortune if I fail to convey to you some part of the interest which is naturally inherent in such researches.

The man who propounds a theory of evolution is attempting to reconstruct the history of the past by means of the circumstantial evidence afforded by the present. The historian of man, on the other hand, has the advantage over the evolutionist in that he has the written records of the past on which to rely. The discrimination of the truth from amongst discordant records is frequently a work demanding the highest qualities of judgment; yet when this end is attained it remains for the historian to convert the arid skeleton of facts into a living whole by clothing it with the flesh of human motives and impulses. For this part of his task he needs much of that power of entering into the spirit of other men's lives which goes to the making of a poet. Thus the historian should possess not only the patience of the man of science in the analysis of facts, but also the imagination of the poet to grasp what the facts have meant. Such a combination is rarely to be found in equal perfection on both sides, and it would not be hard to analyze the works of great historians so as to see which quality was predominant in each of them.

The evolutionist is spared the surpassing difficulty of the human element, yet he also needs imagination, although of a different character from that of the historian. In its lowest form his imagination is that of the detective who reconstructs the story of a crime; in its highest it demands the power of breaking loose from all the trammels of convention and education, and of imagining something which has never occurred to the mind of man before. In every case the evolutionist must form a theory for the facts before him, and the great theorist is only to be distinguished from the fantastic fool by the sobriety of his judgment—a distinction, however, sufficient to make one rare and the other only too common.

The test of a scientific theory lies in the number of facts which it groups into a connected whole; it ought besides to be fruitful in pointing the way to the discovery and coordination of new and previously unsuspected facts. Thus a good theory is in effect a cyclopedia of knowledge, susceptible of indefinite extension by the addition of supplementary volumes.

Hardly any theory is all true, and many are not all false. A theory may be essentially at fault and yet point the way to truth, and so justify its temporary existence. We should not, therefore, totally reject one or other of two rival theories on the ground that they seem, with our present knowledge, mutually inconsistent, for it is likely that both may contain important elements of truth. The theories of which I shall have to speak hereafter may often appear discordant with one another according to our present lights. Yet we must not scruple to pursue the several divergent lines of thought to their logical conclusions, relying on future discovery to eliminate the false and to reconcile together the truths which form part of each of them.

In the mouths of the unscientific evolu-

tion is often spoken of as almost synonymous with the evolution of the various species of animals on the earth, and this again is sometimes thought to be practically the same thing as the theory of natural selection. Of course those who are conversant with the history of scientific ideas are aware that a belief in the gradual and orderly transformation of nature, both animate and inanimate, is of great antiquity.

We may liken the facts on which theories of evolution are based to a confused heap of beads, from which a keen-sighted searcher after truth picks out and strings together a few which happen to catch his eye, as possessing certain resemblances. Until recently, theories of evolution in both realms of nature were partial and discontinuous, and the chains of facts were correspondingly short and disconnected. At length the theory of natural selection, by formulating the cause of the divergence of forms in the organic world from the parental stock, furnished the naturalist with a clue by which he examined the disordered mass of facts before him, and he was thus enabled to go far in deducing order where chaos had ruled before, but the problem of reducing the heap to perfect order will probably baffle the ingenuity of the investigator forever.

So illuminating has been this new idea that, as the whole of nature has gradually been reexamined by its aid, thousands of new facts have been brought to light, and have been strung in due order on the necklace of knowledge. Indeed, the transformation resulting from the new point of view has been so far-reaching as almost to justify the misapprehension of the unscientific as to the date when the doctrines of evolution first originated in the mind of man.

It is not my object, nor indeed am I competent, to examine the extent to which

the theory of natural selection has needed modification since it was first formulated by my father and Wallace. But I am surely justified in maintaining that the general principle holds its place firmly as a permanent acquisition to modes of thought.

Evolutionary doctrines concerning inanimate nature, although of much older date than those which concern life, have been profoundly affected by the great impulse of which I have spoken. It has thus come about that the origin and history of the chemical elements and of stellar systems now occupy a far larger space in the scientific mind than was formerly the case. The subject which I shall discuss to-night is the extent to which ideas parallel to those which have done so much towards elucidating the problems of life, hold good also in the world of matter; and I believe that it will be possible to show that in this respect there exists a resemblance between the two realms of nature, which is not merely fanciful. It is proper to add that as long ago as 1873 Baron Karl du Prel discussed the same subject from a similar point of view, in a book entitled '*The Struggle for Life in the Heavens.*'¹

Although inanimate matter moves under the action of forces which are incomparably simpler than those governing living beings, yet the problems of the physicist and the astronomer are scarcely less complex than those which present themselves to the biologist. The mystery of life remains as impenetrable as ever, and in his evolutionary speculations the biologist does not attempt to explain life itself, but, adopting as his unit the animal as a whole, discusses its relationships to other animals and to the surrounding conditions. The physicist, on the other hand, is irresistibly impelled to form theories as to the intimate

¹ *Der Kampf um's Dasein am Himmel* (zweite Auflage), Denicke, Berlin, 1876.

constitution of the ultimate parts of matter, and he desires further to piece together the past histories and the future fates of planets, stars and nebulae. If then the speculations of the physicist seem in some respects less advanced than those of the biologist, it is chiefly because he is more ambitious in his aims. Physicists and astronomers have not yet found their Johannesburg or Kimberley; but, although we are still mere prospectors, I am proposing to show you some of the dust and diamonds which we have already extracted from our surface mines.

The fundamental idea in the theory of natural selection is the persistence of those types of life which are adapted to their surrounding conditions, and the elimination by extermination of ill-adapted types. The struggle for life amongst forms possessing a greater or less degree of adaptation to slowly varying conditions is held to explain the gradual transmutation of species. Although a different phraseology is used when we speak of the physical world, yet the idea is essentially the same.

The point of view from which I wish you to consider the phenomena of the world of matter may be best explained if, in the first instance, I refer to political institutions, because we all understand, or fancy we understand, something of politics, whilst the problems of physics are commonly far less familiar to us. This illustration will have a further advantage in that it will not be a mere parable, but will involve the fundamental conception of the nature of evolution.

The complex interactions of man with man in a community are usually described by such comprehensive terms as the state, the commonwealth, or the government. Various states differ widely in their constitution and in the degree of the complexity of their organization, and we classify

them by various general terms, such as autocracy, aristocracy or democracy, which express somewhat loosely their leading characteristics. But, for the purpose of showing the analogy with physics, we need terms of wider import than those habitually used in politics. All forms of the state imply inter-relationship in the actions of men, and action implies movement. Thus the state may be described as a configuration or arrangement of a community of men; or we may say that it implies a definite mode of motion of man—that is to say an organized scheme of action of man on man. Political history gives an account of the gradual changes in such configurations or modes of motion of men as have possessed the quality of persistence or of stability to resist the disintegrating influence of surrounding circumstances.

In the world of life the naturalist describes those forms which persist as species; similarly the physicist speaks of stable configurations or modes of motion of matter; and the politician speaks of states. The idea at the base of all these conceptions is that of stability, or the power of resisting disintegration. In other words, the degree of persistence or permanence of a species, of a configuration of matter or of a state depends on the perfection of its adaptation to its surrounding conditions.

If we trace the history of a state we find the degree of its stability gradually changing, slowly rising to a maximum, and then slowly declining. When it falls to nothing a revolution ensues, and a new form of government is established. The new mode of motion or government has at first but slight stability, but it gradually acquires strength and permanence, until in its turn the slow decay of stability leads on to a new revolution.

Such crises in political history may give

rise to a condition in which the state is incapable of perpetuation by transformation. This occurs when a savage tribe nearly exterminates another tribe and leads the few survivors into slavery; the previous form of government then becomes extinct.

The physicist, like the biologist and the historian, watches the effect of slowly varying external conditions; he sees the quality of persistence or stability gradually decaying until it vanishes, when there ensues what is called, in politics, a revolution.

These considerations lead me to express a doubt whether biologists have been correct in looking for continuous transformation of species. Judging by analogy we should rather expect to find slight continuous changes occurring during a long period of time, followed by a somewhat sudden transformation into a new species, or by rapid extinction. However this may be, when the stability of a mode of motion vanishes, the physicist either finds that it is replaced by a new persistent type of motion adapted to the changed conditions, or perhaps that no such transformation is possible and that the mode of motion has become extinct. The evanescent type of animal life has often been preserved for us, fossilized in geological strata; the evanescent form of government is preserved in written records or in the customs of savage tribes; but the physicist has to pursue his investigations without such useful hints as to the past.

The time-scale in the transmutation of species of animals is furnished by the geological record, although it is not possible to translate that record into years. As we shall see hereafter, the time needed for a change of type in atoms or molecules may be measured by millionths of a second, while in the history of the stars con-

tinuous changes occupy millions of years. Notwithstanding this gigantic contrast in speed the process involved seems to be essentially the same.

It is hardly too much to assert that, if the conditions which determine stability of motion could be accurately formulated throughout the universe, the past history of the cosmos and its future fate would be unfolded. How indefinitely far we stand removed from such a state of knowledge will become abundantly clear from the remainder of my address.

The study of stability and instability then furnishes the problems which the physicist and biologist alike attempt to solve. The two classes of problems differ principally in the fact that the conditions of the world of life are so incomparably more intricate than those of the world of matter that the biologist is compelled to abandon the attempt to determine the absolute amount of the influence of the various causes which have affected the existence of species. His conclusions are merely qualitative and general, and he is almost universally compelled to refrain from asserting even in general terms what are the reasons which have rendered one form of animal life stable and persistent, and another unstable and evanescent.

On the other hand, the physicist, as a general rule, does not rest satisfied unless he obtains a quantitative estimate of various causes and effects on the systems of matter which he discusses. Yet there are some problems of physical evolution in which the conditions are so complex that the physicist is driven, as is the biologist, to rest satisfied with qualitative rather than quantitative conclusions. But he is not content with such crude conclusions except in the last resort, and he generally prefers to proceed by a different method.

The mathematician mentally constructs

an ideal mechanical system or model, which is intended to represent in its leading features the system he wants to examine. It is often a task of the utmost difficulty to devise such a model, and the investigator may perchance unconsciously drop out as unimportant something which is really essential to represent actuality. He next examines the conditions of his ideal system, and determines, if he can, all the possible stable and unstable configurations, together with the circumstances which will cause transitions from one to the other. Even when the working model has been successfully imagined, this latter task may often overtax the powers of the mathematician. Finally it remains for him to apply his results to actual matter, and to form a judgment of the extent to which it is justifiable to interpret nature by means of his results.

The remainder of my address will be occupied by an account of various investigations which will illustrate the principles and methods which I have now explained in general terms.

The fascinating idea that matter of all kinds has a common substratum is of remote antiquity. In the middle ages the alchemists, inspired by this idea, conceived the possibility of transforming the baser metals into gold. The sole difficulty seemed to them the discovery of an appropriate series of chemical operations. We now know that they were always indefinitely far from the goal of their search, yet we must accord to them the honor of having been the pioneers of modern chemistry.

The object of alchemy, as stated in modern language, was to break up or dissociate the atoms of one chemical element into its component parts, and afterwards to reunite them into atoms of gold. Although even the dissociative stage of the

alchemistic problem still lies far beyond the power of the chemist, yet modern researches seem to furnish a sufficiently clear idea of the structure of atoms to enable us to see what would have to be done to effect a transformation of elements. Indeed, in the complex changes which are found to occur spontaneously in uranium, radium and the allied metals we are probably watching a spontaneous dissociation and transmutation of elements.

Nature selection may seem, at first sight, as remote as the poles asunder from the ideas of the alchemist, yet dissociation and transmutation depend on the instability and regained stability of the atom, and the survival of the stable atom depends on the principle of natural selection.

Until some ten years ago the essential diversity of the chemical elements was accepted by the chemist as an ultimate fact, and indeed the very name of atom, or that which can not be cut, was given to what was supposed to be the final indivisible portion of matter. The chemist thus proceeded in much the same way as the biologist who, in discussing evolution, accepts the species as his working unit. Accordingly, until recently the chemist discussed working models of matter of atomic structure, and the vast edifice of modern chemistry has been built with atomic bricks.

But within the last few years the electrical researches of Lenard, Röntgen, Becquerel, the Curies, of my colleagues Larmor and Thomson, and of a host of others, have shown that the atom is not indivisible, and a flood of light has been thrown thereby on the ultimate constitution of matter. Amongst all these fertile investigators it seems to me that Thomson stands pre-eminent, because it is principally through him that we are to-day in a better position for picturing the structure of an atom than was ever the case before.

Even if I had the knowledge requisite for a complete exposition of these investigations, the limits of time would compel me to confine myself to those parts of the subject which bear on the constitution and origin of the elements.

It has been shown, then, that the atom, previously supposed to be indivisible, really consists of a large number of component parts. By various convergent lines of experiment it has been proved that the simplest of all atoms—namely, that of hydrogen—consists of about 800 separate parts; while the number of parts in the atom of the denser metals must be counted by tens of thousands. These separate parts of the atom have been called corpuscles or electrons, and may be described as particles of negative electricity. It is paradoxical, yet true, that the physicist knows more about these ultra-atomic corpuscles and can more easily count them than is the case with the atoms of which they form the parts.

The corpuscles, being negatively electrified, repel one another just as the hairs on a person's head mutually repel one another when combed with a vulcanite comb. The mechanism is as yet obscure whereby the mutual repulsion of the negative corpuscles is restrained from breaking up the atom, but a positive electrical charge, or something equivalent thereto, must exist in the atom, so as to prevent disruption. The existence in the atom of this community of negative corpuscles is certain, and we know further that they are moving with speeds which may in some cases be comparable to the velocity of light, namely, 200,000 miles a second. But the mechanism whereby they are held together in a group is hypothetical.

It is only just a year ago that Thomson suggested, as representing the atom, a mechanical or electrical model whose prop-

erties could be accurately examined by mathematical methods. He would be the first to admit that his model is at most merely a crude representation of actuality, yet he has been able to show that such an atom must possess mechanical and electrical properties which simulate, with what Whetham describes as 'almost Satanic exactness,' some of the most obscure and yet most fundamental properties of the chemical elements. 'Se non è vero, è ben trovato,' and we are surely justified in believing that we have the clue which the alchemists sought in vain.

Thomson's atom consists of a globe charged with positive electricity, inside which there are some thousand or thousands of corpuscles of negative electricity, revolving in regular orbits with great velocities. Since two electrical charges repel one another if they are of the same kind, and attract one another if they are of opposite kinds, the corpuscles mutually repel one another, but all are attracted by the globe containing them. The forces called into play by these electrical interactions are clearly very complicated, and you will not be surprised to learn that Thomson found himself compelled to limit his detailed examination of the model atom to one containing about seventy corpuscles. It is indeed a triumph of mathematical power to have determined the mechanical conditions of such a miniature planetary system as I have described.

It appears that there are definite arrangements of the orbits in which the corpuscles must revolve, if they are to be persistent or stable in their motions. For the purpose of general discussion, which is all that I shall attempt, you may take it that the number of corpuscles in such a community is fixed; and we may state that definite numbers of corpuscles are capable

of association in stable communities of definite types.

An infinite number of communities are possible, possessing greater or lesser degrees of stability. Thus the corpuscles in one such community might make thousands of revolutions in their orbits before instability declared itself; such an atom might perhaps last for a long time as estimated in millionths of seconds, but it must finally break up and the corpuscles must disperse or rearrange themselves after the ejection of some of their number. We are thus led to conjecture that the several chemical elements represent those different kinds of communities of corpuscles which have proved by their stability to be successful in the struggle for life. If this is so, it is almost impossible to believe that the successful species have existed for all time, and we must hold that they originated under conditions about which I must forbear to follow Sir Norman Lockyer in speculating.

But if the elements were not eternal in the past, we must ask whether there is reason to believe that they will be eternal in the future. Now, although the conception of the decay of an element and its spontaneous transmutation into another element would have seemed absolutely repugnant to the chemist until recently, yet analogy with other moving systems seems to suggest that the elements are not eternal.

At any rate it is of interest to pursue to its end the history of the model atom which has proved to be so successful in imitating the properties of matter. The laws which govern electricity in motion indicate that such an atom must be radiating or losing energy, and therefore a time must come when it will run down, as a clock does. When this time comes it will spontaneously transmute itself into an element which needs less energy than was required in the

former state. Thomson conceives that an atom might be constructed after his model so that its decay should be very slow. It might, he thinks, be made to run for a million years, but it would not be eternal.

Such a conclusion is an absolute contradiction to all that was known of the elements until recently, for no symptoms of decay are perceived, and the elements existing in the solar system must already have lasted for millions of years. Nevertheless, there is good reason to believe that in radium, and in other elements possessing very complex atoms, we do actually observe that break-up and spontaneous rearrangement which constitute a transmutation of elements.

It is impossible as yet to say how science will solve this difficulty, but future discovery in this field must surely prove deeply interesting. It may well be that the train of thought which I have sketched will ultimately profoundly affect the material side of human life, however remote it may now seem from our experiences of daily life.

I have not as yet made any attempt to represent the excessive minuteness of the corpuscles, of whose existence we are now so confident; but, as an introduction to what I have to speak of next, it is necessary to do so. To obtain any adequate conception of their size we must betake ourselves to a scheme of threefold magnification. Lord Kelvin has shown that if a drop of water were magnified to the size of the earth the molecules of water would be of a size intermediate between that of a cricket-ball and of a marble. Now each molecule contains three atoms, two being of hydrogen and one of oxygen. The molecular system probably presents some sort of analogy with that of a triple star; the three atoms, replacing the stars, revolving about one another in some sort of dance which can not be exactly described. I doubt

whether it is possible to say how large a part of the space occupied by the whole molecule is occupied by the atoms; but perhaps the atoms bear to the molecule some such relationship as the molecule to the drop of water referred to. Finally, the corpuseles may stand to the atom in a similar scale of magnitude. Accordingly, a threefold magnification would be needed to bring these ultimate parts of the atom within the range of our ordinary scales of measurement.

I have already considered what would be observed under the triply powerful microscope, and must now return to the intermediate stage of magnification, in which we consider those communities of atoms which form molecules. This is the field of research of the chemist. Although prudence would tell me that it would be wiser not to speak of a subject of which I know so little, yet I can not refrain from saying a few words.

The community of atoms in water has been compared with a triple star, but there are others known to the chemist in which the atoms are to be counted by fifties and hundreds, so that they resemble constellations.

I conceive that here again we meet with conditions similar to those which we have supposed to exist in the atom. Communities of atoms are called chemical combinations, and we know that they possess every degree of stability. The existence of some is so precarious that the chemist in his laboratory can barely retain them for a moment; others are so stubborn that he can barely break them up. In this case dissociation and reunion into new forms of communities are in incessant and spontaneous progress throughout the world. The more persistent or more stable combinations succeed in their struggle for life, and are found in vast quantities, as in the cases of

common salt and of the combinations of silicon. But no one has ever found a mine of guncotton, because it has so slight a power of resistance. If, through some accidental collocation of elements, a single molecule of guncotton were formed, it would have but a short life.

Stability is, further, a property of relationship to surrounding conditions; it denotes adaptation to environment. Thus salt is adapted to the struggle for existence on the earth, but it can not withstand the severer conditions which exist in the sun.

G. H. DARWIN.

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

[The president here announced that he proposed to consider various theories of evolution in the heavens in the second portion of his address, to be delivered at Johannesburg on Wednesday, August 30.]

*ADDRESS TO THE MATHEMATICAL AND
PHYSICAL SECTION OF THE BRITISH
ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCE-
MENT OF SCIENCE.¹*

ACCORDING to an established and unchallenged custom, our proceedings are inaugurated by an address from the president. Let me begin it by discharging a duty which, unhappily, is of regular recurrence. If your president only mentions names when he records the personal losses suffered during the year by the sciences of the section, the corporate sense of the section will be able to appreciate the losses with a deeper reality than can be conveyed by mere words.

In Mr. Ronald Hudson, who was one of our secretaries at the Cambridge meeting a year ago, we have lost a mathematician whose youthful promise had ripened into early performance. The original work which he had accomplished is sufficient, both in quality and in amount, to show that much has been given, and that much more

¹ South Africa, 1905.