

and winds has been pushed upward to 94 km. No appreciable further extension is in sight. [See W. G. Stroud, W. R. Bandeen, W. Nordberg, F. L. Bartman, J. Otterman, P. Titus, "Temperatures and winds in the arctic as obtained by the grenade experiment," *IGY Rocket Rept. Ser. No. 1, Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S. Publ.* (1958), pp. 58-79.]

2) The falling-sphere technique for determining upper-atmosphere density, which uses the transit-time accelerometer invented by L. M. Jones, has yielded atmospheric density data in series of experiments during the last few years. [L. M. Jones, F. F. Fischbach, J. W. Peterson, "Seasonal and latitude variations in upper-air density," *IGY Rocket Rept. Ser. No. 1, Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S. Publ.* (1958), pp. 47-57.]

3) In 1958 I proposed to the Air Force Cambridge Research Center an experiment involving a falling sphere with a stable platform and XYZ accelerometers. The experiment is now under study at the University of Michigan Willow Run Laboratories, under contract AF19(604)-5205. It appears that good density determination can be expected at altitudes up to 150 km and horizontal wind determination, at altitudes up to 120 km. Vertical winds can be estimated.

JOSEPH OTTERMAN
Willow Run Laboratories,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

I would like to express my appreciation to Joseph Otterman for his interest in my article and for his amendments to it. It is regrettable that these recent references, although available to me, escaped my attention. The purpose of my article was to call attention to material scattered through the literature. I hope other workers in atmospheric physics will share their discoveries through the pages of *Science* as well as through their own specialized periodicals.

RAYMOND C. STALEY
Department of Meteorology
and Climatology,
University of Washington, Seattle

On Selecting "Immortals"

As a teacher of the history of science, I should like to be instructed by some of your readers. In a recent issue of *Science* [130, 150 (17 July 1959)], a news item lists the 25 "Immortals of Science" whose names will be carved in the walls of the new science building at the University of Bridgeport. I am not interested in the game of fighting for favorite names, but I should like to ask whether anyone can explain how

the electors managed to include the name of Leonardo da Vinci—to be judged a genius, yes, but hardly a scientist, especially on the basis of the criteria set up by the university. In spite of the airplanes and studies of fluid flow, Leonardo did not (i) make "a fundamental discovery regarding the laws of nature," nor was he (ii) "responsible for an invention not based on a previously known fundamental law of nature."

Is this an example of the blind following of tradition? In case there are those who require annotations, let me refer them to the works of Leonardo himself, and to comments by Randall, Duhem, and Sarton.

I. WEBB SURRATT
Institute of Technology, Air University,
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

Tax Deduction

In a recent issue [*Science* 130, 86 (1959)], in discussion of a congressional bill to stimulate private philanthropy, mention is made of an 80-cent dollar for a person with a taxable income of \$5000. This is only the case, though, if the itemized income-tax form is used. For those of us who take a straight 10-percent deduction, a dollar given away consists of 100 cents, with no tax rebate of 20 cents or even 9 cents.

WILLIAM I. MARTIN
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Science Writing

The editors of *Science* and J. Allen Hynek are to be congratulated for the report "Occultation of the Bright Star Regulus by Venus" [*Science* 130, 707 (18 Sept. 1959)]. To paraphrase Hynek's dramatic opening paragraph: In this age it is no longer often that we are given the opportunity to read so beautifully written and so personalized an account of a scientific observation.

As recently as 25 years ago it was not uncommon for an article in a scientific journal to reflect its author's individuality. Hynek's refreshing style may remind us that the literature antedating our present age of self-imposed and editor-imposed conformity is rich with like examples. Perhaps stylistic excellence might some day be revived if we directed our students more insistently to the finest examples in the "classic" literature of our respective fields.


AVRAM GOLDSTEIN
Department of Pharmacology,
Stanford University

WILD* M-20 with Camera II

Fitted with Camera II, this truly versatile microscope permits continuous binocular observation of the specimen, even during exposure. The phototube deflects 25% of the light to the binocular tube, with the remainder going to the Camera. Rapid, accurate focusing is achieved with a special format indicating eyepiece in the binocular tube.

In research and scientific exploration, the M-20 is easily capable of handling any problem which may arise in optical microscopy.

Write for interesting information about the Wild M-20 and its complete range of attachments.



*The FIRST name in Surveying Instruments, Photogrammetric Equipment and Microscopes.

WILD
HEERBRUGG

Full Factory
Services

INSTRUMENTS, INC.

Main at Covert Street • Port Washington, New York
Port Washington 7-4843

In Canada

Wild of Canada Ltd., 157 MacLaren St., Ottawa, Ontario