

Conceiver and First Director of Magnet Lab Was Clearly Lax

On page 60 of your May issue celebrating PHYSICS TODAY's first 50 years, you ran a brief excerpt from a September 1960 story. It announced the founding of a "national magnet research center" at MIT and revealed the important role that Francis Bitter would play in designing and constructing the facility.

As current staff members at what is now the Francis Bitter Magnet Laboratory (so named at his death in 1967), we would like to paraphrase the rest of the 1960 story for your readers to give credit to Benjamin Lax, then head of the solid state division of MIT's Lincoln Laboratory. It was Lax who conceived the idea of the new lab and led the effort to get it funded. Subsequently, he served as the lab's director for its first 21 years.

SIMON FONER

(sfoner@slipknot.mit.edu)

DONALD T. STEVENSON

(dtsteven.mit.edu)

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts

More on Chances of Recent Physics PhD's Getting Faculty Slots

Ben Yu-Kuang Hu, in the July issue of PHYSICS TODAY (page 92), suggests that a good problem to put on a physics PhD qualifier is to figure out the odds of securing a faculty appointment. Like many qualifier questions, this one is not as simple as it seems at first glance and may be more challenging to faculty members than to students, who by and large know the score at this point.

Although crude assumptions need to be applied to even the best published statistical data on yearly faculty replacements, the conclusion is essentially the same: The odds are very low for newly minted physics PhD's. Of the approximately 400 US physics department faculty hires in 1995-96, only about 50 from the postdoctoral pool were hired by PhD-granting physics departments for tenure-track positions, and a comparably small number of new PhDs or postdocs were hired by BS- and MS-granting institutions.¹

The remaining positions were either filled temporarily or filled with more senior people, many of them coming from industry and government laboratories.

By comparison, there were about 1400 new physics PhDs produced in that same academic year, and there were 1000 starting postdocs from physics departments in both the US and other countries. The odds of a postdoc getting a tenure-track position were less than 10%. Interestingly, the odds were no better for those graduating from the most highly rated graduate schools than for the others.

One may quibble about complicating factors such as physicists being hired by nonphysics departments, physicists finding positions abroad, the effects of underreporting and ambiguous reporting and a forthcoming bubble of academic retirees, but it remains very difficult to nudge the odds significantly upward.

With that said, it should be noted that the employment opportunities for young physicists are currently strong for those willing to go outside the academic and basic research arenas. Responses to a survey of the job-market perceptions of young APS members indicate a high level of satisfaction among young physicists who have taken nonacademic positions.¹

Reference

1. S. Preische, APS News, February 1998, p. 4. The article is also available at <http://www.aps.org/apsnews/feb98.html>.

BARRETT RIPIN

(ripin@aps.org)

American Physical Society
College Park, Maryland

How Gamow Dismayed Los Alamos by Taking on a Nuclear Test

In his review of Joseph Albright and Marcia Kunstel's *Bombshell: The Secret Story of America's Unknown Atomic Spy Conspiracy* (PHYSICS TODAY, September, page 61), Lawrence Badash refers to the "domestic controversy over who played the critical role in the development of the Soviet bomb—the scientists or the spooks. . . ." The following anecdote may contribute to that controversy.

In the summer of 1948, I took two courses at Ohio State University taught by a visiting professor, George W. Gamow. A leading theoretician who had trained in the Soviet Union, Gamow had defected to the West in 1934, but had not had any part in the Manhattan Project. One day he announced there would be no lectures the following week. When he returned to class, he told us that he had gone to Los Alamos to take a test. Unfortunately, he indicated to

us, he had passed. The test had been to see whether a Soviet-trained scientist who had access only to unclassified material and the open literature could describe how to build a successful atomic bomb.

NATHAN SPIELBERG

(nspielberg@pipeline.com)

Atlanta, Georgia

Debate on Estimating Asian Nuclear Test Yields Isn't Artless

I am surprised and dismayed to read in PHYSICS TODAY (July 1998, page 45) that so much ignorance continues to exist about the proper procedures for estimating the yields of the Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests conducted last May. It is especially troubling to read David Albright's incorrect statement that "Determining the yield of a nuclear test from seismic data is an art, not an exact science."

In numerous articles, most particularly one that I cowrote with Gerald Marsh and that was published in this very magazine (August 1987, page 36), I made it perfectly clear that accurate yield estimates can be extracted from seismic data, if only people will take the trouble to do the analysis properly.

A note of mine in *Physics and Society* (October 1998, page 10) explains how to achieve accurate yield estimates of the Indian and Pakistani explosions (India said its largest one was 43 kilotons, Pakistan said its was 18 kt; my estimates are 46 kt and 19 kt, respectively).

Thus, it simply is not true that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is endangered by the inability of the US to make accurate estimates of yields.

JACK F. EVERNDEN

(plyasova@gldage.cr.usgs.gov)

Golden, Colorado

ALBRIGHT REPLIES: I stand by my quote. It was made in the context of the Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests, for which scientific information has been scarce regarding the subsurface geology of the test sites and depth of placement of the explosions. In such situations, skill and expert judgment are critical in estimating the yields of tests and assigning a credible uncertainty range to such estimates. These activities are what I was referring to as "art."

Without meaning to do so, Evernden supports my point. His (mean?) yield estimates for the largest Indian and Pakistani tests are considerably higher than those produced, for exam-

ple, by Terry Wallace and by Brian Barker *et al.*¹ India and Pakistan will need to release more information, particularly the results of postshot radiochemical analyses, before we can finally decide which estimates are more accurate.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is important. It needs to be implemented as soon as possible. The growing verification arrangements for the CTBT, which include an increasing number of seismic monitoring stations, will be able to detect nuclear explosions down to very low thresholds.

References

1. T. Wallace, *Seismol. Res. Lett.* **69** (5), 386 (1998). B. Barker *et al.*, *Science* **281**, 1967 (1998).

DAVID ALBRIGHT

(albright@isis-online.org)
Institute for Science and
International Security
Washington, DC

More about Philipp Lenard—Physicist, Nobel, Racist

In responding to two letters regarding both your October 1997 special issue on the discovery of the electron and the ensuing discussion (February 1998, page 13), Max Lazarus states that “what showed signs of being a good-natured debate . . . has been somewhat tarnished by inclusion of the notorious Philipp Lenard, who, thanks to his venomous and open racism, lost all credibility even before the emergence of the Third Reich” (August 1998, page 85).

However, this is Lenard, the 1905 Nobel laureate, honored for his early work on cathode rays, including being the first to successfully create a window to deliver them outside the generating discharge tube. Separately and equally significantly, he was the first to show that the photoelectric effect emission consists specifically of electrons. Moreover, Lenard went on to show that their velocity is independent of the light intensity, and instead that their kinetic energy is dependent on the light frequency. He also made other contributions to physics.

There is no question that Lenard’s virulently expressed racist and nationalistic views were abhorrent, as were his savage attacks on what he called the “dogmatic Jewish physics” of Einstein and others and his early and ardent support of Hitler and National Socialism. He wielded enormous and evil influence in the Third Reich.

Yet, we must not deny him either his place in the history of physics or

his very existence, lest we too become guilty of single-minded hatred.

CLAUDE KACSER

(claude.kacser@umail.umd.edu)
University of Maryland, College Park

German Gains Upper Hand over Latin in ‘Manned’ Spaceflight

James Daniels, in his letter on politically correct politics in physics (October, page 15), takes Stephen Hawking to task for trying to de-gender “manned” spaceflight. I would very much like to follow Daniels’s derivation of “manned” from *manus*, as it would make intelligible the expression “all hands on deck,” when manifestly it is all feet that are on deck. But the latest edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, as well as several American dictionaries that I have checked, trace the word back to the Germanic term for man, which I think is enough to give the PC police jurisdiction here.

JEFFREY F. FRIEDMAN

(jeff@friedman.com)
Dreyfus Corp
New York, New York

James Daniels says that “man,” “man-kind” and “manned” derive not from the Germanic root meaning male human, but from the Latin *manus*, a hand. Alas, his philology is awry.

The modern noun “man” comes in an uninterrupted descent to us from the Germanic parent language by way of the Old English “man” (in Aelfric’s grammar of c. 1000 AD). (The Old English word, however, meant a human being of either sex.) “Man-kind” developed from (and superseded) an older form, which was given in *Beowulf* as “mancynne” and today might be spelled “man-kin” (Aelfric knew Latin, but the *Beowulf* poet would not have.) The verb “to man” (Old English “mannian”) is also from the same Germanic root as the noun, though it is first attested to relatively late, only as recently as 1122.

None of these etymologies have anything to do with the Latin *manus*.

JOHN COLEMAN

(john.coleman@phonetics.oxford.ac.uk)
Oxford University Phonetics Laboratory
Oxford, England

Correction

October, page 84—In the review of *The Quantum Beat*, one of the cowinners of the 1989 Nobel Prize in Physics was misidentified; he was not Wolfgang Pauli, but Wolfgang Paul. ■

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION

(Act of 12 August 1970; Section 3685, Title 39, USC)

1. Title of publication: PHYSICS TODAY
2. Publication no.: 0031-9228
3. Date of Filing: 1 October 1998
4. Frequency of issue: Monthly
5. No. of issues published annually: 12
6. Annual subscription price: \$165.00
7. Location of known office of publication: 500 Sunnyside Blvd., Woodbury, NY 11797-2999
8. Location of the headquarters or general business offices of the publisher: One Physics Ellipse, College Park, MD 20740-3843
9. Names and addresses of publisher, editor and managing editor:
Publisher: Charles Harris, American Institute of Physics, One Physics Ellipse, College Park, MD 20740-3843
Editor: Stephen G. Benka, American Institute of Physics, One Physics Ellipse, College Park, MD 20740-3843
Managing Editor: None
10. Owner (if owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual, must be given. If the publication is published by a nonprofit organization, its name and address must be stated.): American Institute of Physics, One Physics Ellipse, College Park, MD 20740-3843
11. Known bondholders, mortgagees and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities: None
12. The purpose, function and nonprofit status of this organization and the exempt status for Federal income tax purposes: Has not changed during preceding 12 months
13. Publication name: PHYSICS TODAY
14. Issue date for circulation data below: July
15. Extent and nature of circulation:
A. Total number of copies (net press run)
Average* 127 858 July** 130 529
B. Paid and/or requested circulation
1. Sales through dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales
Average* none July** none
2. Paid or requested mail subscriptions
Average* 121 439 July** 124 081
C. Total paid and/or requested circulation (sum of B1 and B2)
Average* 121 439 July** 124 081
D. Free distribution (samples, complimentary and other free)
Average* 1 804 July** 2 048
E. Free distribution outside the mail (carriers or other means)
Average* none July** none
F. Total free distribution (sum of D and E)
Average* 1 804 July** 2 048
G. Total distribution (sum of C and F)
Average* 123 243 July** 126 129
H. Copies not distributed
1. Office use, leftovers and spoiled
Average* 4 615 July** 4 400
2. Returns from news agents
Average* none June** none
I. Total (sum of G, H1 and H2—should equal net press run shown in A)
Average* 127 858 July** 130 529
Percent paid and/or requested circulation (C/G × 100)
Average* 98.54% July** 98.38%

* Average number of copies of each issue during preceding 12 months.

** Actual number of copies of single issue published nearest to filing date.

I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete.

Richard Baccante, Treasurer