

LETTERS

see nothing wrong with the acceleration of charged particles by a localized space-charge potential gradient. A more detailed discussion refuting the ideas suggested in Bryant's letter has recently been published.¹

Although probes on satellites have observed such localized electric potentials,² several key questions remain concerning their origins, their physical properties and their interaction with plasma waves and particles. Collecting the data necessary to address these questions is one of the chief goals of the FAST Small Explorer satellite.

References

1. J. E. Borovsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 1054 (1992).
2. See, for example, F. S. Mozer *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 292 (1977); L. P. Block, C. G. Falthammar, *J. Geophys. Res.* **95**, 5877 (1990); and refs. in ref. 1.

DANIEL N. BAKER

GORDON CHIN

ROBERT F. PFAFF JR

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center
9/92 Greenbelt, Maryland

Supersymmetry History Addendum

Pierre Ramond's letter on the development of supersymmetry (May 1992, page 13) is a very appropriate complement to the article by Savas Dimopoulos, Stuart A. Raby and Frank Wilczek, but it does not give a complete history as yet.

André Neveu, John H. Schwarz and Ramond did indeed make the key step of discovering closed algebras of graded commutators, but the field theoretic aspect was completely absent from their discussions. We introduced this aspect in an article entitled "Field Theory Interpretation of Supergauges in Dual Models."¹ There we gave the first example of a supersymmetric Lagrangian. It involved two-dimensional spin-0 and spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ fields, and we formulated the corresponding superconformal transformations. This supersymmetry was called supergauge because its parameters depend upon the (two-dimensional) space-time coordinates. Moreover, this work led us to consider, for the first time, transformations with anticommuting parameters, another key step toward supersymmetry as we now know it. We believe that our work played a significant role in the subsequent developments by Julius Wess and Bruno Zumino.


Reference

1. J.-L. Gervais, B. Sakita, *Nucl. Phys. B*


MBE Technology Leadership

WORLD record GaAs mobility, HEMT mobility, best lattice-matched quaternary material or just innovative research – it all happens with Intevac MBE Equipment.

Intevac has a 17 year history of success in the MBE, CBE and Gas Source MBE equipment business. Let our expertise support your device research and production.



Rapid response Group V source



POINT™, a powerful new spectrometer system for automated substrate temperature measurement

For systems, sources, facts and figures, contact Intevac's MBE marketing department at (408) 986-9888.

intevac

MBE Equipment Division

Corporate Headquarters: 3550 Bassett Street, Santa Clara, California 95054.

Phone 408-986-9888. Fax 408-727-7350

European Headquarters: Oberachweg 3B, 8138 Rottach-Egern, Germany.

Phone 08022 67 03 11. Fax 08022 67 00 12

Circle number 75 on Reader Service Card

34, 632 (1971); reprinted in J. Schwarz, ed., *Superstrings*, vol. 1, World Scientific, Singapore (1985), p. 248.

JEAN-LOUP GERVAIS
Ecole Normale Supérieure
Paris, France

BUNJI SAKITA
City College of the City University
of New York
New York, New York

6/92

Gamma-Ray Bursters: Another Scenario

Your excellent news story "Compton Observatory Data Deepen the Gamma-Ray Burster Mystery" (February 1992, page 21) is thorough but not quite complete. I have proposed another cosmological speculation to explain gamma-ray bursters in a paper entitled "The Strong Magnetic Field AGN-Quasar-Galaxy Formation Paradigm."¹ My 30-year-old strong-magnetic-field model for the cores of active galactic nuclei and quasars postulates the existence of an extremely intense, relativistic, gravitationally bound current loop around the central object, presumably a black hole.^{2,3} A large fraction of the energy of the original gravitational collapse is stored in the current loop.

With an isotropic distribution observed for gamma-ray bursts by the Compton Gamma Ray Observatory, a reasonable concept from this strong-magnetic-field model is that when chunks of neutral matter (of asteroid size, perhaps) race across the intense primordial relativistic current loop, gamma-ray bursts of 1–500 seconds are produced, similar to what happens when one passes a target through an electron synchrotron beam. From table 1 in reference 3, which is deduced from a classic paper by Julian Schwinger,⁴ the electron energy in the current loop is estimated to be as high as 100 GeV for a young, newly forming galaxy.

If only $1/10^9$ of the galactic mass makes up the gravitationally bound current loop, the stored energy in the loop is about 10^{58} ergs, a significant fraction of which can be converted into gamma rays by a variety of well-known nuclear reactions and other processes. The millisecond rise times of spikes in the gamma bursts describe the size of the slender filaments that make up the current loop, and the intensity time pattern of the burst indicates the loop structure. The cyclotron resonance lines observed previously are consistent with the extremely intense magnetic field adjacent to the gravitationally bound current loop.

The strong magnetic field's competitor, the thermal accretion disk model, has severe problems, as emphasized by Wayne Stein⁵ and others. In addition, a recent paper by K. P. Rauch and Roger D. Blandford⁶ has, for one particular quasar, ruled out not just the quasistatic disk but the thick disk and, in fact, all other opaque thermal models. Since the strong-magnetic-field model is clearly not an opaque thermal model, it is still viable and perhaps the leading candidate for the "central engine" for AGN quasar cores. Details on the production of gamma-ray bursts in this model will be reported elsewhere.

References

1. H. D. Greyber, in *Testing the AGN Paradigm*, AIP Conf. Proc. 254, S. S. Holt, S. G. Neff, C. M. Urry, eds., AIP, New York (1992), p. 467.
2. H. D. Greyber, in *Quasistellar Sources and Gravitational Collapse*, I. Robinson, ed., U. Chicago P., Chicago (1964), p. 389.
3. H. D. Greyber, in *The Center of the Galaxy*, M. Morris, ed., Kluwer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands (1989), p. 335.
4. J. Schwinger, *Phys. Rev.* **75**, 1912 (1949).
5. W. A. Stein, *Astrophys. J.* **351**, L29 (1990); **373**, 54 (1991).
6. K. P. Rauch, R. D. Blandford, *Astrophys. J.* **381**, L39 (1991).

HOWARD D. GREYBER
2/92 Potomac, Maryland

Clemson University Clarification

I read with interest the news story entitled "Signs of Tighter Job Market Grow; More than Recession at Work," by Jean Kumagai and William Sweet (March 1992, page 55). I was surprised to see Clemson University described as a liberal arts college that received 550 applicants for one faculty position in physics. Clemson is, in fact, the technically oriented land grant university for South Carolina and has a PhD-granting department of physics and astronomy. The number of vacant positions in the department was five. Because of reductions in the state budget, we will probably fill only two this year to ensure sufficient startup funds for the successful candidates. The number of graduate students and the level of external funding in the department have been increasing rapidly in recent years, the intellectual environment is stimulating, and the climate is delightful, but even all that probably does not explain the sudden increase in applicants for faculty posi-

tions (734 compared to 450 last year). The search committee tells me that most of the applicants were highly qualified American citizens. As your news story correctly points out, there was a large number of candidates from industry and the weapons-oriented national laboratories.

PETER J. McNULTY
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina
5/92

KUMAGAI AND SWEET REPLY: We apologize for the errors.

The Millikan Mail Drop Experiment

In response to the letters by Jerry Fields (October 1991, page 150) and Mike Seeds (March 1992, page 102) I would like to say that at least one physicist has been honored with a US stamp. Robert Millikan was on a stamp (the 45-cent stamp, I think). Considering that postal officials are going to honor songwriters and have honored comedians, I would support a series of stamps honoring scientists in various fields. Letters do make a difference; if you agree, the address is Citizens' Stamp Advisory Board, US Postal Service, 475 L'Enfant Plaza SW, Washington DC 20260.

WILLIAM J. RICE
4/92 La Porte City, Iowa

Why the Matthew Effect Is Self-Evident

Douglas Brewer's letter (October 1991, page 154) discusses the naming of the Matthew effect in science—the phenomenon of credit being given to the "haves" and being withheld from the "have-nots"—and concludes that it results from a "selective reading of the literature" (namely, the Gospels). It is interesting that Brewer cites a secondary source¹ for the modern description of the effect, not the primary source.² Had Brewer followed the paper trail, he might have discovered what some of us recall: His main point—that Mark described the same effect and published before Matthew—had already been made by Charles D. Geilker,³ whose analysis suggests that the ultimate source was probably Jesus ("private communication"). Brewer's citation of John 15:2, however, does add to Geilker's work.

When the same saying or story (for example, the Christmas story) appears in several Gospels, Matthew is usually cited, perhaps because many people find Matthew the most stylish