adventure. When, for example, he had arrived at the instability of the pear-shaped figure, he proceeded at once to risk applying it to reconstruct our views of stellar evolution, instead of following the secure path, and, shall we say, generalising his result for a pear-shaped body of n-dimensions. But Jeans' contributions to cosmogony are not to be summed up in snappy sentences—that the solar system was formed by tidal disruption, that a spectroscopic binary cannot be formed until a comparatively high density is reached, that star-streaming must be in the transverse direction, and so forth. How these suggestions will stand twenty years hence, we cannot predict. As Jeans has said: "It has not been part of our task to arrive at a conclusion; the time for arriving at conclusions in cosmogony has not yet come." There are many who think that conclusions of this kind are a measure of the success of an investigator; but they make a great mistake. He is spinning the threads of a great synthesis; and it would be scarcely human, nor indeed scientific, not to cast curious glances at the pattern which is being formed, of which we can gain elusive glimpses. I will not predict how far the final fabric will be like that which we now seem to see through the eyes of our Medalist; but I will predict that in that fabric there are stout threads of his spinning which will not have to be unpicked.

His later volume, *Astronomy and cosmogony* (1928), was less successful. This can be largely attributed to the fact that he chose to take a stand in the growing problems of stellar constitution which was opposed to the natural line of development we owe to Eddington. This was unfortunate, but his critical attitude was not without value. On the positive side we should credit him as a pioneer in the difficult investigations of the stability of gaseous stars and for first drawing attention to the phenomenon of radiative viscosity.

No account of Jeans's life would be complete without mention of his popular books. Their phenomenal sales were equaled only by a few imaginative or religious works. His literary success might have been predicted from his treatises, the nonmathematical sections of which can be enjoyed even by the layman. As expositions of science, these popular books are unexcelled. But they also include his philosophical deductions from modern science, which were contentions. He emphasized the part played by mathematics in science and elevated the second law of thermodynamics into a position of supreme importance. And from the fact that the most important physical laws are statistical in character, he deduced the general indeterminism of Nature. He tended to a form of idealism approaching that of Bishop Berkeley, whom he admired. These opinions could be, and were, easily criticized. But as a contemporary has written, "It should not be forgotten how infinitely preferable they were to the barren scepticism into which so many men of science had sunk, and how great a part Jeans played in rescuing science from that morass."

S. CHANDRASEKHAR
Yerkes Observatory, University of Chicago

Boston Meeting Statistics

John M. Hutzel
Assistant Administrative Secretary, AAAS

The 113th meeting of the AAAS was held in Boston December 26–31, 1946. Ninety-nine years ago, September 24, 1847, the Association of American Geologists and Naturalists meeting in Boston passed a resolution transforming itself into the American Association for the Promotion of Science. A committee was formed to draft the Constitution and Rules of Order, and at the first meeting of the new society, held in Philadelphia the following year, the name was modified to the American Association for the Advancement of Science. In 1849 the Association held its second meeting in Cambridge, and since that date has met in Boston six times: in 1880, 1898, 1909, 1922, 1933, and 1946.

During the early period of its existence the growth of AAAS was reflected in the size of the meetings. In the last two decades, however, the size of the meetings has leveled off while the membership curve has steepened. At the Boston Meeting in 1933, 2,351 persons registered and 1,500 papers were read. In 1946, 2,736 registered and 1,332 papers were presented. The number of members in 1933 was 18,553, whereas in 1946 membership had increased to 31,000.

As the affiliated societies have grown in membership, several that originally met with AAAS have chosen to meet independently to avoid difficulties imposed by hotel limitations. Unfortunately, the advantage of meeting separately is offset to some degree by the disadvantage of isolation. One of the major aims of the Association is to facilitate cooperation among scientists. AAAS maintains an active interest in the major fields of science through its sections, and its annual meeting is now the only place where integrating programs can be developed.

The registration for the meeting at Boston by states and foreign countries was as follows: Africa, 1; Alabama, 7; Alaska, 1; Arizona, 1; Argentina, 1; Arkansas, 1; Belgium, 2; Bermuda, 3; Brazil, 4; California, 41; Canada, 66; China, 2; Colorado, 9; Connecticut, 110; Delaware, 7; Washington, D. C., 107; Ecuador, 1; England, 6; Florida, 14; France, 2; Georgia, 16; Greece, 1; Holland, 1; Hawaii, 2; Idaho, 0; Illinois, 102; India, 3; Indiana, 47; Iowa, 31; Italy, 1; Java, 2; Kansas, 9; Kentucky, 7; Louisiana, 16; Maine, 51; Maryland, 109; Massachusetts, 728; Michigan, 68; Minnesota, 44; Mississippi, 6; Missouri, 20; Montana, 4; Nebraska, 6; New Hampshire, 39; New Jersey, 108; New Mexico, 2; New York, 448; North Carolina, 22; North Dakota, 1; Ohio, 94; Oklahoma, 15; Oregon, 1; Palestine, 1; Pennsylvania, 131; Puerto Rico, 3; Rhode Island, 38; Siam, 1; South Carolina, 7; South Dakota, 3; Tennessee, 12; Texas, 28; Utah, 5; Venezuela, 5; Vermont, 21; Virginia, 34; Washington, 3; West Virginia, 7; Wisconsin, 40; and Wyoming, 11.