

Circle No. 62 on Readers' Service Card



Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, coal miners have a separate disability award that is based on the assumption (known to be erroneous) that simple CWP is a disabiling condition. Moreover, the disability criteria on which awards are based are the same as those for chronic bronchitis and emphysema. That this is unfair to nonminers should be apparent to all.

If a man has a disease or injury which precludes his working, society has a responsibility to him. Compensation should be paid irrespective of how his injury or disease originated or how many quarters he has paid Social Security. This can best be effected through the Social Security Administration. Let there be a contribution from industry to the fund that is based on an actuarial assessment of the frequency of industry-related injury and disease. The present haphazard system of each state having its own workmen's compensation laws is grossly unfair and is often discriminatory. In some states, awards are inadequate and difficult to obtain, and in many instances up to 50 percent of the award finds its way to the pocket of a lawyer. A federally administered system would ensure that the disabled man, rather than a third party, receives the benefits.

W. KEITH C. MORGAN CHARLES E. ANDREWS

School of Medicine, West Virginia University, Morgantown 26506

Newton and the Mint

The danger of relying solely on aging classical histories is illustrated in L. A. Segal's letter "Newton, the politician" (21 Jan., p. 255). Sir John Craig (1) gives the following description of Newton's tenure as Warden of the Mint: "The credit given to Newton . . . is doubly wrong. The Great Recoinage was a social crime, and its principles had not been advocated by him." Examination of the chronology indicates that the laws were passed and issuance of the new coin and collection of the old begun before Newton assumed his new post. Craig quotes Montague's description of the position to Newton as not having "too much business to require more attendance than you may spare." Craig concludes that Newton managed "varied business with diligence and a moderate efficiency . . . but . . .

did not set the course of events on any new bearing."

Montague's appointment of the inexpert Newton can hardly be considered an exemplary instance of the "cooperation between politicians and intellectuals to solve a pressing social problem." Segal's pronouncement may even arouse indecorous mirth among the frivolous-minded who know Voltaire's scurrilous tale that the position was Montague's way of rewarding Newton for having so amiable a niece. LEONARD N. BECK

3722 North Edison Street, Arlington, Virginia 22207

References

J. Craig, Newton at the Mint (Cambridge Univ. Press, London, 1946).
Voltaire, "Dictionnaire philosophique" in Oeuvres Complètes (Imprimerie de la Société Littéraire-Typographique, Kehl, 1785), vol. 42, p. 165

Ki'lo·me'ter

Some years ago, I noticed that a European friend pronounced the word for a thousand meters, ki'lo me'ter, whereas I was pronouncing it, ki-lom'e-ter'. I consulted my dictionary, Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language (Merriam-Webster, Springfield, Mass., ed. 2, 1950). It said that this word should be pronounced kil'o·me'ter, but sometimes pronounced ki-lom'e-ter' "by false analogy with" ba-rom'e-ter. Following this, I tried to correct my pronunciation of the word and succeeded in doing so.

Because many scientists are still using the second (erroneous) pronunciation, I again consulted a dictionary. Webster's Third New International Dictionary (1961) gives both pronunciations as acceptable. This is because we scientists have used the wrong pronunciation for many years, and, of course. the dictionary tries to keep up with us, or perhaps better to keep down with us. Should we then use the following pronunciations-mil·lim'e·ter', cen·tim'eter', ki·log'ram, ki·lov'olt, and so forth?

May I appeal to all my friends (if I have any friends after complaining about such details) to use the same pronunciations that are used in European countries.

HAROLD C. UREY

Department of Chemistry, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla 92037



... for the very first time

you can have shadowless incident

Bausch & Lomb's new, patented

Coaxial Illuminator beams pre-

StereoZoom 7 Microscope

into those problem areas. The light is then reflected back up the opposite side it originally traveled. The result is such a completely different view of the specimen that you may find it hard to believe your own eyes. You can use infinitely variable magnification over a range from 15× to 280× and anywhere in

aligned light down through both sides of the

illumination of recessed areas, deep crevices, reflecting surfaces

between. Field diameter ranges from 0.55 in. to 0.03 in. You do not

sacrifice valuable working distance

as with conventional vertical

■ High eyepoint eyepieces,

flat fields, accurate eye level magnification readings on the zoom

knob plus Bausch & Lomb quality

optics... there's a combination that

illuminators.