

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