ity are in fact contradicted by the data in the rest of the report. Reference 1 is not even mentioned, though it is the largest study ever conducted and Condon knew it. There is a great deal more that might be said about the inadequacy of the "Scientific Study of UFO's." More to the point, a UFO study committee set up by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics concluded after three years that the University of Colorado study did *not* resolve the question of UFO reality and that what is needed are more quantitative investigations by members of the engineering and scientific community. Clearly, with Man having already walked on the moon, it is time to lift the "laughter curtain" and start thinking instead. A good source of information is reference 3 and the many documents referenced therein.

References

1. *Project Blue Book Special Report No. 14,* UFO Research Institute, Pittsburgh.
2. D. J. Gilmor, *Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects* (The Condon Committee Report), Dutton (1969).
3. *Symposium on UFO's* Hearings, House Committee on Science and Astronautics, 90th Congress, 29 July, 1968. Catalog No. PB 179541, CFSTI.

STANTON T. FRIEDMAN
Redondo Beach, Calif.

Complete translation

At the end of the preface to his book *Classical Mechanics* (Addison Wesley, 1953) Herbert Goldstein uses the Hebrew abbreviation תושלב"ע
It is an obscure abbreviation, each letter being the first in one of the following words:

finished תם
and completed ונשלם
praise שבח
to the Lord לאל
creator בורא
of the world עולם

IRVING GERSH
HARVEY F. CARROLL
Kingsborough Community College
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Book-review objections

As the editor of the volume *Hadrons and their Interactions,* reviewed by San-Fu Tuan and Walter A. Simmons from the University of Hawaii (March, page 87), I would like to make two remarks:

The first one refers to an obviously incorrect statement by the reviewer concerning the delay of publication, which is stated to be about six months longer than the true delay. In this context it should be noticed that the unquoted delay of the review turns out to be much longer (20 months) than the publication delay. (Apparently it takes longer to make up criticisms than to write the original lectures.) It would have been much more profitable for the reader of PHYSICS TODAY to read a review of the more recent volume of the Ettore Majorana International School of Physics, *Theory and Phenomenology in Particle Physics* published in July 1969 by Academic Press.

The second remark refers to the rather questionable judgment of the reviewer, who speaks freely of "highly qualified lecturers," of "essentially pedagogical lectures," of "limited freshness in presentation" and of "humorous variant." The contributors to the above-mentioned volume do not need anybody's defense; however, it should be clearly stated that the extremely valuable set of lectures contained in the volume represents an uncommon example of translation into pedagogical language of those problems and ideas that were (and mostly still are) at the frontier of physics research. Probably to appreciate the value of the volume it is necessary to be actively engaged in this fascinating field of modern research. For these physicists it is not so easy to speak in terms of "humorous variant," when referring to people like Murray Gell-Mann and Tsung Dao Lee.

ANTONINO ZICHICHI
Ettore Majorana Centre for Scientific Culture
Bologna

THE AUTHOR COMMENTS: In our review of the 1967 Majorana Proceedings we pointed out that about one half of the volume was devoted to reproduction of seminars and commented that the value of these had diminished as a result of the delay of 17 months between the end of the School and the receipt of the volume for review (we received the volume in December 1968 and completed the review in February 1969—within the three-months review period requested by PHYSICS TODAY). We feel that this delay may not be an unreasonable measure of the time required for the volume to reach researchers in the field. A way out of this may be to compile the seminars (or abstracts thereof) in a separate technical report with wide distribution to interested physicists. This procedure was suggested to me sometime ago by S. Brodsky as something done rather successfully in an European Summer School in past years, and I adopted it in connection with the Third Hawaii Topical Conference in Particle Physics in August 1969. We *entirely* agree with Zichichi that it is most unfortunate that so great a delay occurred in the publication of the review.

My own philosophy toward reviews

letters

of physics is the same be it for a book review, a proceeding, or for the *Physical Review Journal*, namely an honest attempt is the best procedure. Perhaps I feel this more keenly now that science and technology (at least in the US) is coming under increasing public attack.

However, I do not feel Zichichi should be greatly exercised over words like "highly qualified lecturers" or "essentially pedagogical lectures," because these are almost standard verbiage in the review process. The statement "limited freshness in presentation" can well be a reflection of the time delays mentioned above. In his letter, Zichichi took particular exception to our use of the term "humorous variant." We would like to point out that these words were used specifically in reference to a well known joke by Murray Gell-Mann (*Proceedings of the XIIIth International Conference in High Energy Physics*, Berkeley, 1966) in which the word "Chimeron" was coined. Both terms were in fact mentioned in my own recent paper on the "Chimeron Model of the Intermediate Vector Boson W" (*Ann. Phys.* **59**, 80, 1970). They were not used to characterize any of the research described or any of the physicists who contributed to the volume. We regret that our meaning in this instance has somehow been misconstrued.

Finally I would like to emphasize again that my opening statement about delays is not to be construed as criticism of the editorial staff of the Majorana School. Having both observed and directed several Topical Conferences and Summer Schools over the past few years, I am particularly sympathetic to the plight of the Director–Editor of these schools who often has to contend with tardy lecture notes, less than perfect agreement with publishers, reviewers (not me though!) who are delinquent with their reviews, to name a few.

S. F. TUAN
University of Hawaii
Honolulu

Correction

SEPTEMBER 1969, page 95—Joseph Agassi, who reviewed *Government Contracting and Technological Change* by Clarence Danhof, advises us that he did not have the opportunity to see the edited version of his review before it appeared and that, unfortunately, omission of material in the editorial process has resulted in a distortion of his views, making them appear to be more pessimistic than he had intended on the question of R & D. □