



New short columns stand up to HPLC

New short columns with economical disposable cartridges and quick disconnect fittings for fast replacement can save you a bundle of money if you do many routine LC separations.

In any routine analysis when a few thousand plates will suffice, you should switch to our short column technique in the interests of efficiency and economy.

New short columns are packed with 10 micrometer sorbants of the same quality and type used in the longer columns. The packed 4.6 mm x 10 cm column is disposable. Cartridges are connected to the LC system through a holder with quick disconnect low dead volume fittings. When the column is worn out, you simply throw it away. Save the holder and put in a new cartridge. Costs are about half that of standard 25 cm HPLC columns.

Nine different sorbants covering reverse phase, adsorption, polar bonded and ion exchange modes of LC are available. Sorbants are of the same materials used in standard HPLC columns.

More information.

We invite your inquiry on these new Brownlee columns. For a complete description write for our new four page brochure. Please address Rheodyne, Inc., 2809 Tenth Street, Berkeley, CA 94710. Phone (415) 548-5374.


RHEODYNE

THE LC CONNECTION COMPANY

Circle No. 199 on Readers' Service Card

the small and medium-sized companies, where the absence of such skills now makes their interaction with universities more difficult. This may, therefore, exclude these companies from participation in joint university-industry research programs of the type that the National Science Foundation is attempting to promote (2). Although this trend is the direct result of judgments made by the managements of these industries (and perhaps reflects the view that more short-term than long-term investment is desirable at this time), the long-term impact of this change in policy is extremely detrimental to the country as a whole. The companies that will be able to participate in this program are those which need this assistance least, as they already have a reasonable internal component of basic research. Most of these companies will, in fact, shy away from the program because of its extra administrative burden. The result can be a generally unfavorable response to the program.

To counteract this unfortunate trend, it may be necessary for Congress to provide certain tax incentives to industry to promote basic research. With a basic research core reestablished in many of the companies that have now abandoned it, the hope for a more successful promotion of joint university-industry research programs through the National Science Foundation grants may come closer to reality.

MICHAEL M. SHAHIN

Webster Research Center,
Xerox Corporation,
Rochester, New York 14644

References

1. National Science Board, *Science Indicators 1976* (National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., 1977).
2. "Industry/university cooperative research activity" (Notice No. 72, Office of the Director, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., 29 March 1978).

Velikovskianism

One of Anthony F. Aveni's concluding statements in his review (20 Jan., p. 288) of *Scientists Confront Velikovsky* (1), a collection of papers from a 1974 AAAS symposium, is: "As far as Velikovskianism is concerned it is dead and buried. The final nail has been driven." Nothing could be further from the truth.

In its November 1977 issue, which appeared about the same time as *Scientists Confront Velikovsky*, *KRONOS*, an interdisciplinary journal devoted to the investigation of Velikovsky's theories,

presented a very effective answer to the criticism in the book. That issue, which has been published as a book under the title *Velikovsky and Establishment Science* (KRONOS Press, Glassboro State College, Glassboro, N.J.; vi, 144 pp., illus., \$9.95; also available in paperback version at \$5), contains Velikovsky's AAAS address "My challenge to conventional views in science," rebuttals by Velikovsky to the arguments of four of his critics at the AAAS meeting, a special answer by Velikovsky to ten points raised by Carl Sagan, and rebuttals by six Velikovsky supporters to criticism contained in *Scientists Confront Velikovsky*. These articles show that the present-day critics of Velikovsky have not learned anything from the mistakes of those of the 1950 era, some of whom were shown not to have read the work they were criticizing.

I was not fortunate enough to attend the AAAS Velikovsky symposium. However, I did purchase the five cassette tapes prepared by the AAAS covering the morning and evening sessions of the symposium. After listening to them numerous times, including Velikovsky's rebuttals from the floor, I concluded that Velikovsky had the better of all arguments.

It is my personal opinion that anyone considering criticizing Velikovsky's work would do well first to read all his books carefully. Then he or she should read all the pro-Velikovsky writings such as those contained in *Pensée*, *KRONOS*, and *SIS Review*. I think it is probable that, having done so, a critic who is honest with himself or herself would be changed from anti-Velikovsky to pro-Velikovsky.

F. THOMAS LOWREY

2230 Clairmont Drive,
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15241

References

1. D. Goldsmith, Ed., *Scientists Confront Velikovsky* (Cornell Univ. Press, Ithaca, N.Y., 1977).

... In paragraph two of his review, Aveni misrepresents the time scale and disarranges the sequence of Velikovsky's cosmological scenario. According to *Worlds in Collision*, Venus was not ejected from Jupiter 2500 years ago as Aveni states; 2500 years ago would have been 166 years after the last cosmic catastrophe (-687) proposed by Velikovsky. . . .

LEWIS M. GREENBERG

KRONOS,
Glassboro State College,
Glassboro, New Jersey 08028