

pared with the reported observation² of anisotropy at 8°, the clustering of clusters³ compared with the clustering of galaxies⁴ and of galaxies about clusters,⁵ as well as the abundance of rare events such as a great attractor. The latter may well turn out to be an overly coherent interpretation of a complex large-scale velocity field; other methods relating the data to theory do not indicate a problem with the inflation picture for universes dominated by cold dark matter.⁶ I also agree that constraining our velocity field to one that would arise near a large mass overdensity (or deep potential minimum) such as a great attractor certainly leads to larger velocities,⁷ but the problem shifts to one of assessing whether the constrained structure (great attractor) is too rare to be accommodated by the inflationary theory in question. This depends upon how coherent the velocity field is.

Density fluctuations from inflation that break the "natural" scale-invariant outcome of inflation are certainly possible.⁸ What is debatable—and Kofman and I have had many enjoyable sessions on this point—is how probable these "designer" spectra are, which build a specific characteristic scale required by the large-scale data into the fluctuations by tuning scalar potential parameters or initial field configurations. Similar tunability problems afflict attempts to build non-Gaussian fluctuations that would agree with all of the data, although this is an area that has not been systematically explored.

References

1. I. A. Strukov, D. P. Skulachev, A. A. Klypin, in *Proc. Int. Astronomical Union Symp. 130*, J. Audouze, A. Szalay, eds., Reidel, Boston (1987).
2. R. D. Davies, A. L. Lasenby, R. A. Watson, E. J. Daintree, J. Hopkins, J. Beckman, J. Sanchez-Almeida, R. Rebolo, *Nature* **326**, 462 (1987).
3. N. Bahcall, R. Soneira, *Astrophys. J.* **270**, 70 (1983).
4. E. J. Groth, P. J. E. Peebles, *Astrophys. J.* **217**, 385 (1977). S. Maddox, G. Efsthathiou, in *Proc. Int. Astronomical Union Symp. 130*, J. Audouze, A. Szalay, eds., Reidel, Boston (1987).
5. P. Lilje, G. Efsthathiou, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, in press (1988).
6. *Large Scale Motions in the Universe*, Proc. Pontifical Acad. Sci. Study Week 27, 9–14 November 1987, The Vatican, in press; see especially the article by N. Kaiser.
7. J. R. Bond, in *Large Scale Motions in the Universe*, Proc. Pontifical Acad. Sci. Study Week 27, 9–14 November 1987, The Vatican, in press.
8. J. M. Bardeen, J. R. Bond, D. S. Salopek,

in *Proc. Second Canadian Conf. on General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics*, A. Coley, C. Dyer, eds., World Scientific, Singapore (1987). J. M. Bardeen, J. R. Bond, D. S. Salopek, in *Large Scale Motions in the Universe*, Proc. Pontifical Acad. Sci. Study Week 27, 9–14 November 1987, The Vatican, in press. See also the references in Linde and Kofman's letter.

J. RICHARD BOND
Canadian Institute for
Theoretical Astrophysics
Toronto, Canada

3/88

'Mini-Universes': Too Big to Be Seen?

The article by Andrei Linde on inflationary theory (September 1987, page 61) was refreshing because it opened up possibilities rather than closing them down. But Linde says that "any observer in the inflationary universe can see only those processes occurring nearer than H^{-1} , as illustrated in figure 3." If this is true, then exterior "mini-universes" have no scientific meaning because they cannot be observed. If, however, other mini-universes can exist within the space-time of our own universe, then we have the very interesting possibility of observing regions where physics is much different from our own, present-day, terrestrial physics.

He only implies in the next few sentences that two inflationary domains might "eat one another, or do each other any damage." I think it might be worthwhile from the standpoint of many unexplained observational anomalies in astronomy to discuss a little more fully whether what Linde calls "classical space-time domains emerging from space-time foam" could be related to young matter emerging from singular regions in extragalactic space.¹

Reference

1. F. Hoyle, J. V. Narlikar, *Action at a Distance in Physics and Cosmology*, Freeman, San Francisco (1974). H. Arp, *Quasars, Redshifts and Controversies*, Interstellar Media, 2153 Russell St., Berkeley, Calif. 94705 (1987).

HALTON ARP
Max-Planck-Institut für Physik
und Astrophysik
Garching bei München
10/87 Federal Republic of Germany

LINDE REPLIES: Halton Arp raises several interesting questions. Domains with low-energy physics different from ours in general may be small, and this actually may have important observational consequences.¹ However, typically their

size is much greater than the size of the currently observable part of the universe. One will be able to see such domains in the distant future when the size of the observable part of the universe, which is proportional to its age, has become large enough. But even now these domains have a quite real scientific meaning for those who live in them.

Reference

1. L. A. Kofman, A. D. Linde, *Nucl. Phys. B* **282**, 555 (1987).

ANDREI D. LINDE
Lebedev Physical Institute
Moscow, USSR

3/88

Don't Belittle Big Science

I read Leo Kadanoff's essay "The Big, the Bad and the Beautiful" (February, page 9) with mixed emotions. I applaud his statements about the importance of basic research and the criteria that should be used in its evaluation: "The true value of science is in the development of beautiful and powerful ideas.... We should push for the kinds of work that are of enduring intellectual and technical value." But I am dismayed by his suggestion that the merit of a scientific project depends upon its size.

Nothing intrinsic to big science prevents it from leading to valuable, beautiful ideas; for that matter, nothing inherent in small science guarantees that it will be worthwhile. Indeed, it is revealing that Kadanoff offers no criticism of a field that exemplifies big science—high-energy physics—on its merits. Past support of large particle physics projects has been rewarded with the discovery of CP violation and hence better understanding of the evolution of the universe; with the observation that protons and neutrons are composed of even smaller constituents; and with the unification of the weak and electromagnetic interactions, and the indications of a possible common origin of all forces—all beautiful and powerful ideas of enduring intellectual value. Similar examples in other fields are readily available. The work that Kadanoff himself favors, with "neutron sources that might give insight into the new superconductors," requires big facilities: large, expensive, high-flux reactors. If the goal of a scientific project is worthy, it should be pursued in whatever style is most appropriate.

I also disagree with the opinion that small science offers a better training ground for graduate students. Just as

in small-science disciplines, graduate students in high-energy physics plan small experiments (as part of routine data taking or of constructing, debugging and testing apparatus), build the necessary equipment and analyze the data as part of their thesis work. Frequently this is done in small groups, comparable to those in other branches of physics. In addition graduate training offers students involved in big science opportunities to learn from professionals in other fields and to develop the ability to work in large groups, which can be highly beneficial in their postgraduate careers.




Finally, I am puzzled by Kadanoff's views on basic-research funding. He states, "I do not think that the nation's or the government's budget for research or R&D is too small," but presents no supporting evidence. He himself writes that "over the last seven years, we have seen attrition in support for small-group efforts." During the same period the funding level for construction of new facilities in high-energy physics was about one-third (when corrected for inflation) of what it was around 1970. The fraction of GNP that is devoted to basic research in the US is smaller than in Japan and many Western European countries. Kadanoff refers to "billions for the Superconducting Super Collider, but inadequate funds to even run the neutron sources" mentioned above. I, too, deplore the underutilization of our scientific facilities for lack of money. However, I should point out that the \$3.2 billion (in 1988 dollars) for construction of the SSC is the result of an integration over ten years and is, so far, strictly virtual: Not a penny has been appropriated. The associated R&D program receives less than one-third of the amount of funding that was projected as necessary four years ago.

The worth of a scientific project cannot be judged *a priori* on the basis of its size. Rather, we should determine if it represents intellectually and technically valuable research and then press for the resources necessary to carry it out.

STANLEY G. WOJCIK
Stanford University
Palo Alto, California
and SSC Central Design Group
Universities Research Association
Berkeley, California

Nuclear Test Estimates Yield Criticism

The article "Yields of US and Soviet Nuclear Tests" by Jack F. Evernden



Voyager image courtesy of NASA and JPL
VAX/VMS are trademarks of
Digital Equipment Corp.

Scientific Data Reduction & Analysis.
Publication Quality Graphics.
Image Processing.

IDL software integrates it all

- Compatible with VAX/VMS™ computer systems, most graphic terminals and image display systems
- Lets you see your data at every step
- Allows immediate interactive compilation and execution
- Vector and array operators for powerful interactive capabilities


Quickly transform your raw data into results using IDL's advanced features, including: Statistical Analysis, Interpolation, Smoothing, Curve Fitting, Data Editing, Modeling, Interactive Graphics, Image Processing Display and Analysis.

To receive our informative IDL brochure call or write:

RSI RESEARCH SYSTEMS, INC.
2021 Albion St. Denver CO 80207 (303) 399-1326


Circle number 80 on Reader Service Card

ECR MICROWAVE PLASMA ION SOURCES



Source Schematic

- BEAM OR STREAM SOURCES
- WIDE ION ENERGY RANGE
- BROAD OPERATING PRESSURE RANGE
- NO FILAMENT—IDEAL FOR REACTIVE GASES
- HIGH IONIZATION EFFICIENCY
- COMPACT DESIGN, VERSATILE MOUNTING CONFIGURATIONS
- VARIOUS APPLICATIONS INCLUDING: DEPOSITION, ETCHING, RIBE, IMPLANTATION



20eV O₂ Ion Stream

MICROSCIENCE
We deliver innovation.

Headquarters: 41 Accord Park Drive, Norwell, MA (617) 871-0308
West: 2372 Qume Drive, San Jose, CA (408) 943-0111
Mid Atlantic: 1011 Brookside Road, Allentown, PA (215) 398-1501
South: 810 Office Park Circle, Lewisville, TX (214) 221-9483

Circle number 81 on Reader Service Card