



**From Sensors
to Complete Systems**

CRYOGENICS

PROPYLENE	226.1
HYDROGEN SULFIDE	213.5
CARBON DIOXIDE	194.6
ACETYLENE	189.1
ETHANE	184.8
NITROUS OXIDE	183.6
ETHYLENE	169.3
XENON	164.0
OZONE	161.3
KRYPTON	121.3
METHANE	111.7
OXYGEN	90.1
ARGON	87.4
FLUORINE	86.0
NITROGEN	77.3
NEON	27.2
DEUTERIUM	23.6
HYDROGEN	20.4
HELIUM 4	4.2
HELIUM 3	3.2
ABSOLUTE ZERO	0

KELVIN



Since 1967, Scientific Instruments, Inc. has provided the measurable difference in cryogenic sensing and instrumentation.

Thermometers: Germanium, Platinum, Gallium Arsenide Diode, Silicon Diode & Chromel vs Gold Thermocouple • Digital Readouts • Microprocessor Based Temperature Controllers • Liquid Level Indicators/Gauging Systems • Liquid Level Controllers • Constant Current Generators • Industrial Temperature Transducers

For Complete Specifications Contact:

Scientific Instruments, Inc.

1101 25th Street, West Palm Beach, Florida 33407
(305) 659-5885 Telex: 51 3474

Circle number 87 on Reader Service Card

See the difference



ITT's Intensified Spectroscopic Instruments offer high sensitivity, zero distortion and wide spectral range — from UV to near IR. The instrument's intensified linear solid-state-array can be gated as fast as a few nanoseconds.

We can custom design our instruments to your particular needs in: Fluorescence Spectroscopy • High-speed spectral signature analysis • Spot and void detection • Flash and pulse measurement

You'll see the difference in your computerized spectral measurement and automation systems with: Improved quality of measurement • Increased productivity • Wider versatility

Put ITT's electro-optical experience to work for you — you'll see the difference.

Contact ITT Electro-Optical Products Division, P.O. Box 3700, Fort Wayne, IN 46801, (219) 423-4341, TWX: 810-332-1413, Telex: 232-429.



**ELECTRO-OPTICAL
PRODUCTS DIVISION**

ITT

Circle number 88 on Reader Service Card

letters

continued from page 15

kin's letter is the charge that I am calling for unilateral disarmament. Suppose that, at the farthest limit of my dreams, the scientists and engineers in the US should decide that they will stop contributing their efforts to the further escalation of the arms race. That would leave our generals with only 25 000 nuclear warheads for the "defense" of our people. Is that disarmament? One could imagine a one-sided halt in the technological race over a long period of time that would lead to a serious imbalance or instability; but no sensible person (not I) would tolerate getting into such a situation. Is the technological weapons race so finely tuned that even a brief halt would spell "defeat"? I think it is clearly not. Finally, it is widely acknowledged that the US is the leader in new technologies and the US is now setting the pace of escalation in the nuclear arms race; this adds logic to taking the first steps to stop the race right here.

The concept of large numbers of scientists and engineers actively withdrawing from the nuclear arms race seems farfetched by all our past experience. Yet the threat of nuclear war is quite great enough, I believe, for this idea to be given the most serious consideration by all.

CHARLES SCHWARTZ
University of California
Berkeley

2/85

Small-scale research

In my article, "Research in small groups," the scientist in the picture of laser spectroscopy in the laboratory of Theodor Hänsch (March, page 78) is Christopher Foot. The photograph was taken by Frans Alkemade. I regret the error in the caption.

DANIEL KLEPPNER
Massachusetts Institute of
Technology

4/85

Physics news in 1984

In my article, "Convection patterns" (January, page S-37), I referred to the experiments at the University of California at Santa Barbara without giving proper credit to V. Steinberg, either in the text or in the first reference. The experiments were conducted by V. Steinberg, G. Ahlers and D. S. Cannell. I apologize for this inadvertent error.

JERRY P. GOLLUB
Haverford College

2/85

Haverford, Pennsylvania □