

letters

the report had to be adjusted to fit the imported element." (Emphasis added.)

Thus the "major recommendation of the Enquiry" (to which you refer) was grafted on when the draft of the report was deemed not satisfactory. Your editorial grants it an artificial respectability which it does not deserve.

The problem of compensation due copyright owners for photocopying has not "already been solved by the recently established Copyright Clearance Center." Ask H. William Koch, Director of AIP, who serves as its Vice-Chairman. Unfortunately, too many librarians do not "concede publishers should be paid" for photocopying. Many flout the copyright law and either do not register with CCC, or do register and simply don't pay for their photo copying.

You speak of "the tendency of the publishing industry to indulge in the proliferation of new scientific journals..." Publishers don't indulge; they follow the lead of physicists and other scientists who cogently identify growing areas of research that require the exchange of information provided by journals. Journals don't proliferate; they parallel the trends in science and, as you know, there has been an explosion and acceleration in scientific research in our lifetimes.

I hope you don't really accept "that the trend to copying in place of subscribing is inevitable" because the continuation of this practice will clearly kill many high quality specialized journals with small followings. The new copyright law spells out quite clearly that such copying is illegal.

Your colorful but cliché references to "unnecessary proliferation of journals" and "the rising flood of printed paper" can only do a disservice to the many scientists who press continually for new journals to reflect new or increased activity in advancing disciplines.

I am not in total disagreement with your editorial. I come close to sharing your view that journals should not be subsidized. As a start, why don't we propose to Koch and the AIP governing board that AIP's own journals give up the page charges with which they are currently being subsidized?

Or is it only the non-AIP journal that should have just one library subscription for the whole country and no subsidy from page charges?

ALLAN WITTMAN

Wiley-Interscience Journals
New York, New York

3/10/80

Chinese for physics

Gary Zukav arranged his book *The Dancing Wu Li Masters* (reviewed by Robert March, August 1979, page 54)

within the framework of phonetically similar Chinese characters. In his framework, the Chinese term for physics, WU-LI, is said to also mean MY WAY, NONSENSE, I CLUTCH MY IDEA, ENLIGHTENMENT. Unfortunately, the above "beautiful tapestry" is meaningless and even erroneous.

If MY WAY and NONSENSE can be related to PHYSICS simply because they all sound alike to one who speaks only atonal languages, then there is no reason to exclude from the same framework the following: ARMED FORCES, EXHAUSTION, FIVE MILES, BLACK FOXES, DIRTY CARP, and so on (all pronounced WU-LI). Further, "to clutch" does not read as WU but should be pronounced as WO. In any event, PHYSICS does not sound like any of the above if one reads the same ideograms in Cantonese. Furthermore, the Chinese had been using GEZHI for physics for many years before the term WU-LI was adopted from the Japanese language in the twenties. It should be noted that neither BUTSURI (Japanese) nor GEZHI (any Chinese dialect) has anything to do with MY WAY or MY IDEA.

In Mandarin Chinese, physics is indeed phonetically the same as *IN THE MIST*; in Japanese, Buddha is read as "butsu" and "ri" can be used as reason or truth. These are better subjects to elaborate if one decides to bring Oriental mysticism into science.

Finally, the ideogram for socks is also read to mean WU in Cantonese. What are we going to do with PATTERNS OF SOCKS?

KENNETH Q. LAO
General Electric Co.

10/2/79

Schenectady, New York

Another visit to the USSR

May I comment on data relevant to Timothy Toohig's "Guest Comment" (February, page 9)? My data were accumulated during a National Academy of Sciences exchange visit from 9 November 1978 to 1 July 1979, during most of which time my wife and daughters, ages 7 and 11, were with me. The host institution was the Ioffe Physico-Technical Institute in Leningrad; however my work was done in the chair of optics at Leningrad State (Government) University.

First, we also were given the utmost hospitality. The spectrum of people who took us into their homes, who were our guests, and/or who participated with us in cultural activities ran from 100% to 0% as relates to connection with our official visit, and from doctors of physical and mathematical science to zero as relates to educational background. We worshipped in Seventh-day Adventist and Baptist and Russian

Orthodox churches; we were received with sincere love. It is difficult for me to believe that all of this was an orchestrated "snow job" for the benefit of US audiences.

Second, the trade of source references and the exchange of potentially publishable ideas seemed totally frank and open. In fact, the only occasion where I felt that we had been deliberately cut out from access to something we wished to witness was a grade-school class-discipline session.

Third, we encountered very few Soviets who seemed less than friendly to America. A series of films were released for TV and cinemas during our stay, entitled "The Great Patriotic War" in the USSR and "The Unknown War" in America. Jointly produced by Soviet and American producers from World War II footage, these films depict massive American aid to the USSR; some who had been making anti-American remarks ceased doing so when they saw these scenes.

Fourth, we also feel that we contributed to the causes of peace and humanity. Our children appeared at School #105 neatly dressed in the proper uniforms and (to their credit) won the hearts of classmates and teachers alike; my wife shopped, prepared meals, rode the public transportation, and talked in her warm way with Soviet citizens; I was able to commute and work with, to attend faculty meetings and seminars with, and to lecture to many Soviets (all this in Russian). We spoke to Soviet Academy of Sciences officials and to Leningrad City officials about their country and about ours.

I understand the feelings of those whose views on these international situations differs from ours, or who may interpret our data more cynically. I am grateful for the even-handedness of the editors of *PHYSICS TODAY*, which has been evident over a span of years, and for my place in a profession that attempts to be as objective as possible in the collection and interpretation of data.

RAY HEFFERLIN
Southern Missionary College
Collegedale, Tennessee

2/27/80

Humor wanted

For a second edition of *A Random Walk in Science*, I should welcome contributions of humor in science, historic and contemporary: anecdotes, witty accounts, cartoons, self-deceptions, hoaxes. Especially sought are items which, while humorous, also have value for history and insight. Please identify fully the sources of contributions.

ROBERT L. WEBER
104 Davey Laboratory
3/3/80 University Park, Pa 16802 □