breaking into a new field is quite common, and it is just this sort of treatment which can be mitigated by procedural changes. These should include, but not be limited to, the institution of reciprocal anonymity.

CHRISTOPHER SHERMAN
Andover, Massachusetts

2/81

Save the ads

Despite the contrary views voiced by J. H. Mauldin in his letter in February (page 110), I believe that for the majority of the Americans the day after election was a happy, not sad, day! This, however, is irrelevant, for PHYSICS TODAY is not a political and sociological forum.

The purpose of my writing this is my one-man campaign against the practice of "stripping" advertising material from scientific journals before binding or storing them. This material has considerable potential use as a ready source of information concerning suppliers of equipment and services, and for identification of inherited apparatus. In the long run, though, there is something of considerably greater importance. Think, for example, how much concerning the state of physics and other sciences could be learned from a study of unstripped issues of a scientific journal of even fifty years ago. For the history of physics this material is of much importance and deserves preservation.

In some libraries it is customary to bind only pages bearing consecutive roman numbers, and this not only results in the loss of advertising material but also valuable cover illustrations. I have always instructed my binder to "bind all," and I would strongly urge others to do the same, so as to provide historians of physics in the future with important and interesting material.

I think that the new format is fine, and I particularly like the new spine with its clear identification of the issue when on the shelf.

E. SCOTT BARR
Tuscaloosa, Alabama

3/81

Mid-career women

In response to Michele Kaufman's letter in February (page 13), her complaint regarding the Kennedy bill's lack of support for mid-career women scientists is without basis. To quote the bill, which is now Public Law 96-516, Section 33, "Women in Science": "The Foundation is authorized to ... make grants, to be known as the National Research Opportunity Grants, to women scientists who (A) have received their doctorates within five years prior to the date of the award

letters

or (B) *have received their doctorates, have had their careers interrupted, and are re-entering the work force within five years after such interruption . . .*" (my emphasis).

The NSF Authorization Act *does* respond to women scientists in mid-career. My disagreement with it stems from its lack of support for women seeking the PhD. In that area it makes vague attitudinal commitments, as opposed to monetary ones.

Unfortunately, this whole issue may now be moot, considering Mr. Stockman's proposed and, I think, now effective removal of the "Women in Science" part of the Act as part of Mr. Reagan's program to trim the budget.

CHARLOTTE WING WALES
3/81 *Washington, D.C.*

THE AUTHOR COMMENTS: If the NSF would interpret "women scientists with careers interrupted" to include women who have been working for the past six years in temporary, year-to-year positions such as research associate or non-tenure-track faculty, then I would withdraw my complaint. There are just too many mid-career female scientists in such anomalous positions, and these women are being discriminated against by Public Law 96-516. If the National Research Opportunity Grants are reinstated, I hope that the present restrictions are removed and the grants are made available to all women scientists in untenured positions, with preference given to women who are at least six years past the PhD. Recent PhDs in post-doctoral positions don't need additional grants.

MICHELE KAUFMAN
The Ohio State University
3/81 *Columbus, Ohio*

Theory or force?

In the abstract of their article, "Unified Theory of Elementary-Particle Forces" (September, page 30) Howard Georgi and Sheldon Glashow claim that the weak, electromagnetic and strong interactions appear to be "no more than different components of the same fundamental force." I should like to ask the authors, however, if what they are dealing with is a *unified theory* of (several) forces or a theory of (a single) *unified force*?

The distinction seems to me to be crucial. Up to the present time a force was "fundamental" if it had a unique (set of) source(s): mass (of one sort only), charge (of 2 types, + and −), color (3 kinds), and so on, and a unique carrier(s); graviton, photon, and so on, by which energy and momentum was transported across space. In this context Georgi and Glashow have a unified