CORRESPONDENCE

British Optical Astronomy

SIR,—Dr Burbidge's highly personal account of his likes and dislikes in British astronomy provides the occasion for comment that may prove more constructive.

I have myself sometimes been critical of British astronomy, and can agree with some of Dr Burbidge's historical comments, although in my view the chief fault has been undue deference to the supposition (probably mistaken anyway) that a large "prestige" telescope was politically more acceptable than the diversity of an observing system optimized for cost-effectiveness. Although having reservations about site testing¹, where Dr Burbidge criticizes the sites of British telescopes I would tend rather to question the design of the telescope itself. The Anglo-Australian Schmidt for example appears to be designed for survey work and to lack the accuracy needed in a production instrument, so far as can be surmised from the information publicly available.

Times have changed, however, and the new generation of British astronomers that has become influential in recent years is unlikely to repeat the old mistakes, which are now accordingly largely irrelevant. In common with all who try to do something creative, these astronomers will make new mistakes of their own which it will be the task of the next generation to correct. The conditions that led to the long delays in the Isaac Newton Telescope no longer prevail, and indeed some of the questionable decisions were more the responsibility of Government and Treasury policy at the time than the free choice of the astronomical establishment, however complacent or misguided it may have been.

Of course much in British optical astronomy is third rate, as is much in American astronomy or for that matter much of anything in any country. The normal criterion is to look at what stands out, and here British astronomy need have no fear of international comparisons. GALAXY² was developed for less than one-tenth of the probable cost of the 90-inch telescope alone in Dr Burbidge's proposals, and in a couple of years has about doubled the number of accurate positions and magnitudes ever measured in the history of astronomy. These data are giving new insight into the structure of our Galaxy; if it were not so, would not the failure be in the theoreticians? No basis is given for the assertion that

GALAXY has attracted no overseas interest, but I happen to know personally of firm enquiries from both Europe and the Americas. The Radial Velocity Photometer³ has in a similar period enabled one man, working by himself from latitude 52° N and reducing his own data, nearly to double the number of first quality radial velocities known, including a programme of Southern stars. Multiplex Spectrometry⁴ developed internationally from British origins, has provided spectra of Venus and Mars of higher quality than standard solar atlases. The Spectracon⁵ has enhanced by several times the potential of every telescope in the world for some kinds of observation. Further examples will occur to others familiar with other aspects of British optical astronomy; but indeed apologists are not needed for what already speaks for itself.

Experience teaches that complex problems are seldom solved by pursuing a narrow "single goal", and Dr Burbidge's proposals would be suspect for this reason alone. It is moreover ironic that he proposes to copy the American large-reflector tradition, since the West Coast reflectors were developed from the "3-foot" Common reflector presented by Mr Crossley of Halifax to the University of California at the turn of the century. It is at least possible that British astronomers have by now seen beyond this "British, and hence unproven, astronomical innovation" and may wish to do something else.

It is odd also that Dr Burbidge questions qualifications in observational astronomy, while as a theoretician telling British observers and instrument scientists what they ought to do. Astronomical knowledge does not progress in this way, but by a two-way exchange in which observation and theory work together in posing and solving astronomical problems. The synthesis of more effective methods of observation requires mutual interaction in which instrument scientists, observers and theoreticians each contribute from their own knowledge and professional specialization. These developments flourish best when there is free, wide and open discussion, no pre-emption by decisions made behind closed doors, and when the scale of each project is not so large that it must try to please everyone and perhaps ends by pleasing no one.

For these reasons, Dr Burbidge's letter has encouraged me to believe that British optical astronomy is basically

healthy just because it is not committed to the particular approach which he favours.

Yours faithfully,

PETER FELLGETT

Department of Applied Physical Science,
University of Reading

¹ Fellgett, P. B., Cambridge Conference on Astrophysics, July 18–20, 1972, *Observatory* (in the press, 1972).

² Fellgett, P. B., *Optics Technology*, 61 (1970); Reddish, V. C., Cambridge Conference on Astrophysics, July 18–20, 1972, *Observatory* (in the press, 1972).

³ Fellgett, P. B., *Optica Acta*, 2, 9 (1955); Griffin, R., *Astrophys J.*, 148, 465 (1967); *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 145, 163 (1968); 148, 211 (1970); 155, 1 (1971); 155, 499 (1971).

⁴ Fellgett, P. B., Thesis, Univ. Cambridge (1951); *J. Phys. Radium*, 19, 187 (1958); Connes, P., *Optica Acta*, 4, 136 (1957); Connes, J., Connes, P., and Maillard, J. P., *Atlas des spectres dans le proche infrarouge de Venus, Mars, Jupiter and Saturne* (Editions de CNRS, Paris, 1969).

⁵ McGee, J. D., McMullan, D., Bacik, H., and Oliver, M., *Adv. Electronics Electron Phys.*, 28A, 61 (1969).

Refereeing and Editing

SIR,—Here is a suggestion for doing away with the refereeing and editing of papers in scientific journals, for reducing the time and cost of publication and for improving the general standard of presentation.

In principle, the idea would be to put at the disposal of an author in any one year a stated number of pages to publish anything he chooses with no refereeing and no editing. More accurately, the idea would be to credit an author with a number of pages and constrain him (or his institution) to do the refereeing and editing. The scheme could therefore be called ACRE (Author Credit, Refereeing and Editing).

In practice, ACRE could be initiated by the publishers (societies and firms) of several leading journals; afterwards other publishers would have to apply for admission to the scheme. Any practising scientist *S* could apply for a passbook. This would contain a list of all ACRE journals and *S* would enter 1, 2, 3 (say) against a selection of these, and there would be space for him to enter details of his publications over the past 3 years (say). He would send his passbook to the publishers of his selected journal number 1 (*J1*) who would enter the maximum number of pages they would allocate to *S* for the

ensuing year. Publishers *J1* would forward the passbook to *J2* who would make their allocation in the knowledge of what *J1* had done; similarly for *J3*, who would then return the book to *S*. This operation would be repeated each year, or whatever would be found the most useful interval. Any young scientist, or scientist from abroad, or scientist entering a new field, being duly accredited, could be given a standard starting allocation of say five pages in any journal of his choice. In the course of 2 or 3 years he could then work himself into the situation of *S*.

The printing would be done according to a system now coming into use for some reports of symposia, and so on. The journals would supply the author with paper of standard form on which his work would have to be typed according to standard instructions. Each sheet would be photographically reproduced as a page of the journal, exactly as the author submits it. The author would then know automatically how he is using up his page allocation. If a paper is submitted by several authors, they would have to agree among themselves as to how many pages each would contribute from his own allocation, and inform the publishers accordingly.

The advantages to the scientific community generally would include the end of refereeing and editing other people's work, no correcting of printer's proofs, speedier publication and speedier production of offprints, an end to the production of preprints, and a reduction of costs all round. There would be other advantages to the publishers, such as more reliable estimation of the amount of material to be published within any given time.

If an author maintained a high standard, he would earn all the allocation he needs. If an author published bad or badly presented work, he would find his allocation greatly reduced. The discipline on authors would be wonderfully salutary!

The interesting problem would be the business of allocating pages. The publishers of a journal could prescribe a total number of pages for a year. Then they could ask a small panel drawn from the authors who had published most in that journal during a few previous years to allocate this total among the authors applying. The deliberations of the panel might be entertaining—more entertaining than refereeing papers.

Other people can doubtless suggest many improvements to the scheme, but in one form or another it might solve some of the many problems now besetting those who have the responsibility for seeing that scientific research is published as efficiently as possible.

Yours faithfully,

W. H. MCCREA

Astronomy Centre,
University of Sussex

Short RNA Chains

SIR,—It would be interesting to know whether the discovery mentioned by your Cell Biology Correspondent¹ that "short RNA chains can *in vitro* and may *in vivo* act as primers for the self replication of double and single stranded DNAs by DNA polymerases which elongate DNA chains in the 5'-3' direction, polymerizing deoxy nucleotide triphosphates onto 3' hydroxy groups of primers" is related to the finding made some years ago that small amounts of RNAase-resistant RNA seemed to be associated with DNA after the nucleic acids from HeLa cells² or mouse ascites sarcoma cells³ had been separated by chromatography or density gradient centrifugation.

Yours faithfully,

J. S. PEARSON

P. T. SPEAKMAN

Department of Textile Industries,
The University,
Leeds LS2 9JT

¹Nature, 238, 247 (1972).

²Levis, A. G., Kršmanovic, V., and Errera, M., *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, 145, 577 (1967).

³Watson, J. D., and Ralph, R. K., *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, 138, 89 (1967).

Erratum

IN the article "New Antifertility Agent—an Orally Active Prostaglandin—ICI 74,205" by Anant P. Labhsetwar (*Nature*, 238, 400; 1972), the double bond in the upper side chain in ICI 74205 should have been shown in the *cis* and not the *trans* position in the structural formula on p. 401.

International Meetings

October 4, **Application of Finite Elements in Mechanical Engineering Design—A Survey of Current Practice**, London (Institution of Mechanical Engineers, 1 Birdcage Walk, London SW1H 9JJ).

October 12, **Recent Developments in Compact High Duty Heat Exchangers**, London (Institution of Mechanical Engineers, 1 Birdcage Walk, London SW1H 9JJ).

October 16–20, **National Society for Clean Air Conference**, Scarborough (National Society for Clean Air, 134–137 North Street, Brighton BN1 1RG).

October 24–26, **Site Testing of Pumps**, London (Institution of Mechanical Engineers, 1 Birdcage Walk, London SW1H 9JJ).

October 24–26, **The Car of the Future—The Practical Influence of Legislative and Economic Factors—Reliability—Easier Maintenance**, London (Institution of Mechanical Engineers, 1 Birdcage Walk, London SW1H 9JJ).

October 26, **A Study of the Fixation of Fractures using Plates: Clinical Complications of the Use of Such Devices and an Experimental Study of their Characteristics**, London (Institution of Mechanical Engineers, 1 Birdcage Walk, London SW1H 9JJ).

HOW TO BUY NATURE

Volumes start in January, March, May, July, September and November, but subscriptions may begin at any time.

The direct postal price per subscription is:

12 MONTHS* (52 issues per title)

	Surface mail UK and worldwide	U.S.A. and Canada
Nature (Friday)	£14	\$48
Nature + Nature Physical Science	£24	\$83
Nature + Nature New Biology	£24	\$83
All three editions	£29.50	\$108
Annual Index	£1	\$3

*Rates for shorter periods *pro rata* (minimum three months)
(Charge for delivery by air mail on application)

Editorial and Publishing Offices of NATURE

MACMILLAN JOURNALS LIMITED
4 LITTLE ESSEX STREET, LONDON WC2R 3LF
Telephone Number : 01-836 6633. Telegrams : Phusis London WC2R 3LF
Telex 262024

711 NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON DC 20004
Telephone Number : 202-737 2355. Telex 64280

Subscription Department
MACMILLAN JOURNALS LIMITED
BRUNEL ROAD, BASINGSTOKE, HANTS
Telephone Number : Basingstoke 29242

American display advertisements
NATURE SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS INC
711 NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON DC 20004

All other advertisements
T. G. SCOTT & SON, LIMITED
1 CLEMENT'S INN, LONDON WC2A 2ED
Telephone : 01-242 6264/01-405 4743
Telegrams : Textualist London WC2A 2ED
Registered as a newspaper at the Post Office

Copyright © Macmillan Journals Limited, September 22 1972