

letters

We will continue our struggle for all the Soviet Jews we left behind. We urge our American colleagues to join us.

ISAI GOLDSTEIN
GRIGORY GOLDSTEIN
Tel Aviv, Israel

5/86

Refuseniks' plight

We would like to inform PHYSICS TODAY readers about the situation of Marks S. Kovner, a magnetospheric physicist who applied to emigrate from the Soviet Union in 1978. This letter may be of special interest to members of the American Geophysical Union, who only recently began to receive PHYSICS TODAY and therefore may not be aware of the frequent discussions in these pages concerning the situations of scientists who have applied to emigrate from the Soviet Union, and the many ways that their colleagues in the West can help them.

Kovner was a professor in the radio-physics department of Gorky State University and a project director on the staff of the Gorky Radiophysical Research Institute. He had published over 50 papers, most recently on magnetohydrodynamic plasma waves in the Earth's magnetosphere and at the bow shock and on VLF waves. When he first applied to emigrate, he was refused permission "until 1985 for security reasons," although later he was officially told that none of his work was considered secret. He was immediately dismissed from his teaching and research positions, and since then he has been employed in a series of temporary positions, doing such tasks as writing solutions to physics problems for high school students. For the past several years he has not been allowed to travel to Moscow, an unusual restriction even for those who have applied to emigrate. Because Gorky is closed to foreign visitors and his mail from abroad is usually not delivered, Kovner has been completely isolated from other physicists, making it impossible for him to do any serious research. His situation has been made even more difficult because his wife and children were given permission to emigrate to Israel, and did so in 1977 in the hope that he would soon be able to join them.

We urge any readers with similar research interests to send preprints and reprints to Kovner (preferably by registered mail) at the Department of Radiophysics, Gorky State University, Prospekt Gagarina 23, Gorky, RSFSR, USSR. (Letters can also be sent, but

should not discuss politics.) Even more important, those who have contact with Soviet magnetospheric physicists, especially (but not limited to) Soviet physicists who are prominent or who come from Gorky, should express their concern about Kovner and ask why he is still not allowed to emigrate. If the Soviet government sees that there is widespread concern about Kovner, and that its treatment of him harms the reputation of the Soviet Union among those scientists who would normally favor increased international scientific cooperation, then there is hope that he will be allowed to emigrate to Israel, where he can make use of his considerable scientific talents and be reunited with his family.

We wish to remind readers that the well-known Soviet magnetospheric physicist Jacob L. Alpert has also been refused permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union since he first applied in 1975 and was demoted from his position as deputy director of the Institute of Terrestrial Magnetism, Radio Research and Ionosphere. Alpert would also appreciate receiving preprints and correspondence on magnetospheric physics, and would benefit if physicists from outside the Soviet Union would discuss his situation in meetings with Soviet physicists. His address is 2-Oi Mosfilmovskiy Pereulok 21-198, Moscow 119285, RSFSR, USSR.

LOUIS J. LANZAROTTI
A. HASEGAWA
*AT&T Bell Laboratories
Murray Hill, New Jersey*

ALLEN WOLFE
*New York City Technical College of the
City University of New York
Brooklyn, New York*

MICHAEL J. GERVER
GEORGE BEKEFI
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology
6/86 Cambridge, Massachusetts*

Interpreting quasar redshifts

The June 1985 issue of PHYSICS TODAY contained a letter from John Kierein (page 15) advocating the Compton effect interpretation of the quasar redshift. This suggestion, originally made by Arthur H. Compton for solar spectral lines,¹ appears to be untenable for several reasons.

Paul A. M. Dirac showed that for the case of single Compton scattering, thermal motion of the scattering electrons broadens the spectral lines and obscures the line shift, which is comparable to the Compton shift (0.024 Å).² The line shift may even be toward the blue if the electron thermal energy exceeds the photon energy. These results were confirmed by F. N. Edmonds, who ex-

tended the calculations by including the Klein-Nishina formula for electron scattering.³ For multiple Compton scattering Subrahmanyan Chandrasekhar found that the spectral lines would be severely weakened, whereas the line shift would remain small.⁴ Jay Pasachoff and Joseph Silk⁵ and I⁶ have written about other difficulties with the Compton effect interpretation for the solar case, where the observed redshift ordinarily is interpreted as the Einstein gravitational redshift.

The Compton effect interpretation of the quasar redshift encounters even larger difficulties than the solar case because the observed redshifts are very large. The observed widths of the spectral lines place stringent limits on the possible number of scatterings. If large redshifts were produced through Compton scattering the relative shift $\Delta\lambda/\lambda$ would be wavelength dependent, in contrast to the observed shift. Thus it appears that the quasar redshift debate may continue without the Compton effect interpretation.

References

1. A. H. Compton, *Philos. Mag.* **46**, 897 (1923).
2. P. A. M. Dirac, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **85**, 825 (1925).
3. F. N. Edmonds, *Ap. J.* **117**, 298 (1953).
4. S. Chandrasekhar, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond., Ser. A* **192**, 508 (1948).
5. J. M. Pasachoff, J. I. Silk, *Sol. Phys.* **4**, 474 (1968).
6. P. Maltby, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **47**, L21 (1977).

PER MALTBY
*University of Oslo
Oslo, Norway*

7/85

It was disingenuous of John Kierein to write about the Compton effect interpretation of the redshift, citing his earlier article,¹ without mentioning that Joseph Silk and I² responded devastatingly to the suggestion shortly after its publication. Silk and I thought of a long list of reasons why the Compton effect wouldn't work, but just as we were about to send our article off discovered that Evry Schatzman³ and Fritz Zwicky⁴ before him had already pointed out many of the objections, and that Paul A. M. Dirac⁵ and Subrahmanyan Chandrasekhar⁶ had also ruled out the effect. So we shortened our paper, adding references to the previous work.

So it seems that not only is there "a long history associated with these ideas," as Kierein cites, but there is also a long history of rebuttal. I refer interested readers to our article and to the papers cited in it; I believe refereed journals are better places for scientific discussions than letters columns. I am

THE BEST OF BOTH WORLDS

Instant Information At Your Fingertips...

FINET (Physics Information Network) is an Electronic Database Service offered Free of Charge to Members of AIP Member and Affiliated Societies. Services Include:

- Job Notices
- Calendars of Meetings
- Advance Abstracts
- Journal Article Titles
- Online Ordering
- Announcements


FI-MAIL is a State-of-the-Art Electronic Mail System Serving the Entire Physics & Astronomy Community

- No Registration Fee
- No Monthly Charge
- Pay Only for Connect Time and Usage Charges

FURTHER INFORMATION AVAILABLE ONLINE

Dial local Telenet number (for assistance call 1-800-336-0437) ■ At the high-pitched tone, press <ENTER> twice ■ At the display *TERMINAL* = press <ENTER> ■ At the @ prompt, type **TELEMAIL** and press <ENTER> ■ For *Username?*, type **AIP.ONLINE** and press <ENTER> ■ For *Password?*, type **NEWUSER** and press <ENTER> ■ Further details about AIP's electronic services will display along with online registration instructions.

Information Services of the
American Institute of Physics • (516) 349-7800




PRECISION CURRENT INTEGRATOR

BIPOLAR RESPONSE

WIDE RANGE →

HIGH SENSITIVITY →

ISOLATED DIGITAL OUTPUTS →



RED NUN

INSTRUMENT CORP.
P.O. BOX 100, WESTFIELD, N.J. 07091
(201) 233-5427

Circle number 71 on Reader Service Card

"Enthralling"
New Scientist

"An excellent job"
Nature

HISTORY OF PHYSICS

Edited by Spencer R. Weart and Melba Phillips

With an array of accomplished contributors including seven Nobel Prize winners, this critically acclaimed anthology deepens your appreciation of modern physics. Over forty-five articles include . . .

How I created the theory of relativity, **Albert Einstein** • Poincaré and cosmic evolution, **Stephen G. Brush** • The roots of solid-state research at Bell Labs, **Lillian Hartmann Hoddeson** • The giant cancer tube and the Kellogg Radiation Laboratory, **Charles H. Holbrow** • Alfred Lee Loomis—last great amateur of science, **Luis W. Alvarez** • The discovery of fission, **Otto R. Frisch and John A. Wheeler** • J. J. Thomson and the discovery of the electron, **George P. Thomson**.

Over 300 photographs and illustrations • 1985 • 375 pp. • Softcover • \$25.00

Send your order and checks made payable to:
AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PHYSICS
Marketing Center
335 East 45th Street, New York, NY 10017

To place credit card orders, call 1-800-AIP-PHYS; in New York State, call 212-661-9404.

letters

not sympathetic with Kierein's plaint that "you can imagine how difficult it is for people who are not in the club!" I am confident that all his scientifically valid papers will be published.

References

1. J. Kierein, B. M. Sharp, *Sol. Phys.* 3, 450 (1968).
2. J. M. Pasachoff, J. I. Silk, *Sol. Phys.* 4, 474 (1968).
3. E. Schatzman, *The Origin and Evolution of the Universe*, Basic, New York (1965), pp. 187 ff.
4. F. Zwicky, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 15, 773 (1929).
5. P. A. M. Dirac, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* 85, 825 (1925).
6. S. Chandrasekhar, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond., Ser. A* 192, 508 (1948).

JAY M. PASACHOFF
Hopkins Observatory
Williams College

7/85 Williamstown, Massachusetts

KIEREIN REPLIES: Since Galileo, science has progressed more through observation than calculation; hence Edwin Hubble's book *The Observational Approach to Cosmology*. I can calculate that light traveling through air would have image blurring and spectral line broadening. The photons interact strongly with air molecules; their velocity is measurably slowed according to the index of refraction. Calculations of the greater path length traveled at c in *vacuo* that corresponds to the slower velocity in air would show that the photons have deviated from a straight line path, producing blurring! Thermal motion of the molecules would cause line broadening. But observations show no such blurring or broadening. Why? Perhaps the scattering centers act as centers of Christian Huyghens's secondary wavelets that reconstruct the wavefront! No such considerations were given by any of the referenced calculations.

Jay Pasachoff and Joseph Silk claimed that James Brault's observations of the solar sodium D₁ line could not be explained by Compton scattering and that it showed no appreciable center-to-limb variation.¹ This is simply not true. Brault's data do show a center-to-limb variation.² One wouldn't expect this variation to be great, since this line "is emitted high in the Sun's atmosphere"; the variation in path length traveled through the Sun's atmosphere would not be as great as for a line emitted from lower down.

For multiple Compton scatterings to cause the redshift, longer-wavelength photons must undergo more scatterings than shorter-wavelength photons.

The observed shift is proportional to the wavelength, whereas the shift per scattering is independent of wavelength. It is reasonable that the photon's cross section be proportional to its wavelength. The resultant variation of index of refraction with wavelength prompted Grote Reber to suggest that any extragalactic pulsar discovered should exhibit dispersion.³

The controversy may be solved by finding "nearby" quasars using parallax measurements. Very long-baseline interferometry observations have shown proper motion between the quasars 3C 345 and NRAO 512.⁴ A parallax interpretation would indicate that one of these is as near as 15 000 parsecs away, assuming the other is a background object.⁵ Since both quasars may be nearby, they could be much closer than that! Their proper motion could even be co-orbital. Of course, they could also be farther away if their relative motion is a significant fraction of c . More such observations are needed.

The observed correlation between light traveling through electron clouds and the corresponding redshift is so strong that the Compton effect must be considered as its cause. This is much more reasonable than Big Bang cosmologies, superluminal quasar jets, star-sized quasars with ordinary stellar temperature spectra releasing more energy than several galaxies, radio objects extending over hundreds of millions of light years and other inconceivably complex objects conjured up to comply with Doppler redshift interpretations.

References

1. J. M. Pasachoff, J. I. Silk, *Sol. Phys.* 4, 474 (1968).
2. C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, Freeman, San Francisco (1973), p. 1059.
3. G. Reber, *Univ. of Tasmania Occasional Paper* 9 (1977).
4. N. Bartel, M. I. Ratner, I. I. Shapiro, T. A. Herring, B. E. Corey, in *VLBI and Compact Radio Sources*, R. Fanti, K. Kellerman, G. Setti, eds., Reidel, Boston (1984), p. 113.
5. N. Bartel, T. A. Herring, M. I. Ratner, I. I. Shapiro, B. E. Corey, *Nature* 319, 733 (1986).

JOHN KIEREIN
Ball Aerospace Systems Division
Boulder, Colorado

1/87

Correction

January, page 84—The address of the supplier of FORTRAN subroutines is Lektor, P.O. Box 6713, Kennewick, Massachusetts 99336. □