letters

problem at hand, in many situations a good microcomputer is a cost-effective solution.

MARTEN DENBOER
Polytechnic Institute of New York
8/84 *Brooklyn, New York*

SURA upgrade

In June, MIT submitted a proposal to the Department of Energy for upgrading the Bates electron accelerator facility to continuous-beam operation at energies below 1 GeV. Your news article on the SURA accelerator in the Washington Reports section of the September 1984 issue (page 55), creates the impression that the proposed upgrade be viewed as an alternative to the 4-GeV accelerator (CEBAF) recommended for construction at Newport News, Virginia, under SURA management. On the contrary, the NSAC Long Range Plan for Nuclear Science and the reports of NSAC subcommittees on Electromagnetic Interactions (chaired by Peter Barnes), on Electron Accelerator Facilities (chaired by D. Allan Bromley), and on a 4-GeV Electron Accelerator (chaired by Erich Vogt) have all identified the lower-energy electron continuous-beam capability as a major scientific opportunity *complementary* to that offered by CEBAF. Thus our proposed upgrade, which has a cost about a factor of ten less than those of the major construction projects endorsed by NSAC, is fully integrated with NSAC recommendations for providing national research capabilities at the forefront of nuclear science.

ERNEST J. MONIZ
Bates Linear Accelerator Center
9/84 *Middleton, Massachusetts*

No such impression or implication was intended. It is true that DOE and Congress heard arguments from physicists that several projects may be more worthy of funding than CEBAF. It is also true that those projects were not suggested as alternatives to CEBAF but as projects worth doing in their own right. The news account of the controversy surrounding CEBAF does not say or suggest that the Bates machine at MIT or any other existing facility would replace the cw electron accelerator proposed by Southeastern University Research Associates. The troubled waters around CEBAF are now considerably calmed by a new report from a subcommittee of the Nuclear Science Advisory Committee. A news story about that report appears on page 59. —IG

Corrections

June 1983, page 54—In the article on synchrotron radiation, written by Arthur Bienstock and Herman Winick, the caption for figure 6 should have included a reference to R. Z. Bachrach, L. E. Swartz, S. B. Hagstrom, I. Lindau,