

letters

valuable process in itself which he considers a form of publishing.

It has often occurred to me after carefully reading and critically evaluating dozens of student lab reports and hundreds of tests a month that this similar process is also terribly important. While students usually take such work for granted, it is an unusual opportunity to have one's work so carefully considered—this suggestion is valuable, he is told; that is far-fetched, she is warned; this is beautiful; that is misleading and jumbled.

Physics instructors (and students!) should look again at the importance of this critical interaction in developing the skills necessary to do worthwhile work in science and to report it—if only to a referee!

MARK M. PAYNE

St. Benedict's Preparatory School
Newark, New Jersey

9/82

Women Nobels

Laurel Sherman's letter in July (page 80) noted that four women had won the Nobel Prize in science. However, there was a fifth woman, Dorothy Hodgkin, in chemistry in 1964.

STANLEY BASHKIN

The University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

8/82

THE AUTHOR COMMENTS: My letter did not state that there have been only four women to win the Nobel Prize in science; it stated that Maria Goeppert Mayer was the fourth. You will recall that this was in reference to the article by R. G. Sachs which had mentioned that she was the third. There have been two women to win the Prize since Mayer: Dorothy Crowfoot Hodgkin (chemistry, 1964) and Rosalyn S. Yalow (physiology/medicine, 1977)—six in all.

LAUREL G. SHERMAN

9/82

Oberlin, Ohio

Pan American physics

Leon Lederman's Guest Comment in August (page 9) is most timely; please count me among enthusiastic supporters of Pan American collaboration.

As a member of Bruno Rossi's group at MIT, in the era when its work still centered on cosmic-ray research, I first visited the famous high-altitude laboratory on Mt. Chacaltaya (Bolivia) in 1962, when the director was its founder, Ismael Escobar. This summer I visited it for the second time, to attend a Workshop on High Energy Interactions and Related Phenomena. Primarily because of that single facility, Bolivia—perhaps the least developed country of its size in all of Latin America—has made contributions to physics that are great out of all propor-

tion, compared to countries with similarly developed resources.

The Cosmic-Ray Laboratory has functioned in just the manner Lederman advocates, by initiating interaction of young Bolivian scientists with colleagues in the US and Europe. I will cite only a few individuals: Oscar Saavedra, who is now an important member of a group in Turin which pioneered the kind of work now being done in many places to test baryon stability; Nicolás Martinic, who has just returned to be the new Director, after working for several years in the Max Planck Institutes in Germany; and Carlos Aguirre, who remains an excellent physicist but has been drafted to serve his country in a position with the United Nations.

The Workshop participants heard papers by four young Bolivian postdocs, and, at Chacaltaya, they saw the equipment that is producing their data. There was general agreement among the 10 US participants that this equipment is fully up to date, and that, technically, these Bolivians are doing first-rate work.

In his Guest Comment, Lederman emphasized the value to Latin American countries of participation by their young scientists in experiments at major US facilities, a point which is valid beyond doubt. But I think one should also keep in mind those cases where a Latin American country has some unique geographical advantage that justifies motion in the opposite direction: interaction with a viable local group by US scientists bringing advanced technology for application at a facility like the Chacaltaya Laboratory.

I support the idea of a Centro Americano de Investigaciones Nucleares, especially if its mission will include providing material support for that form of interaction, in addition to those Lederman outlined.

JOHN LINSLEY

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

9/82

Corrections

May 1982, page 28—center column, three lines above "Smectic phases": "thin films" should be "defects."


page 28—third column, lines following equation 2 should read: "where the nematic free energy density ϕ_N is given by

$$\phi_N = \frac{1}{2}[K_1(\nabla \cdot \hat{n})^2 + K_2(\hat{n} \cdot \nabla \times \hat{n})^2 + K_3(\hat{n} \times \nabla \times \hat{n})^2]$$


page 29—center column, 23 lines up from bottom, should read: " $r_{||} = \eta$ "

page 31—left column, last paragraph should read "...vivid examples in three dimensions of ideas that arose in lower dimensions; one of the most exciting advances..." □

THE SPECTROSCOPY AMPLIFIER



Model 514
\$975.00



- Bipolar Gated Baseline Restorer accepts Active and Pulse Feedback Preamps
- Built-in Pileup Rejector provides Deadtime Correction and Reject Outputs
- Automatic or Manual BLR Threshold Selection with Setup Monitor Lamp
- Wide Range Gain and Active Shaping Controls

Mech-Tronics

NUCLEAR

430A Kay Ave., Addison, IL 60101

For more information
WRITE OR CALL COLLECT
(312) 543-9304

Circle number 65 on Reader Service Card