

If the ray is travelling perpendicular to the magnetic field H , the deviation $d\theta$ in the distance dx is given by

$$d\theta/dx = 2\pi/2\pi\rho = 1/\rho,$$

where ρ is the radius of curvature. If α is the angle between the original direction of the ray and the plane perpendicular to the magnetic field

$$d\theta/dx = \cos\alpha/\rho. \quad (2)$$

Thus, from (1) and (2)

$$-\frac{1}{\beta c\tau} = \frac{1}{N} \frac{dN}{d\theta} \cdot \frac{d\theta}{dx} = \frac{1}{N} \frac{dN}{d\theta} \left(\frac{\cos\alpha}{\rho} \right),$$

$$\frac{1}{N} \frac{dN}{d\theta} = -\frac{\rho}{\beta c\tau \cos\alpha}. \quad (3)$$

Now

$$mv^2/\rho = Hev/c, \quad (4)$$

and

$$\frac{m}{m_0} = \frac{1}{(1-\beta^2)^{1/2}} = \frac{\tau}{\tau_0}$$

where τ_0 is the rest mean-life. Hence,

$$m_0\tau\beta/\tau_0\rho = He/c^2. \quad (5)$$

If we should take θ as large as 23 degrees and $\cos\alpha = 0.5$, N/N_0 would be 16×10^{-4} . It is therefore obvious that no pencils which have suffered large angles of deviation in the foregoing sense can be expected with any appreciable intensity.

From (3) and (5)

$$\frac{1}{N} \frac{dN}{d\theta} = -\frac{m_0 c^2}{\tau_0 H e c \cos\alpha}$$

from which it will be observed that β , and indeed all having to do with the variable energy of the particle, has disappeared from the right-hand side.

Since

$$\frac{m_0 c^2}{e} = 10^8/300, \text{ and } \tau_0 = 2 \times 10^{-6},$$

$$\frac{1}{N} \frac{dN}{d\theta} = -\frac{10^6}{3 \times 2 \times 10^{-6} \times 3 \times 10^{10} H \cos\alpha} = \frac{-100}{18 H \cos\alpha}.$$

If $H = 0.7$, we have

$$N = N_0 \exp[-8\theta/\cos\alpha].$$

Thus, for example, if $\theta = 0.2$ corresponding to about 11.4 degrees

$$N = N_0 \exp[-1.6/\cos\alpha],$$

and, if $\alpha = 60^\circ$,

$$N = N_0 e^{-3.2} = 0.04 N_0 \text{ approx.}$$

¹ It will turn out that the number which survive after the deviation θ will be determined entirely by θ , regardless of any *explicit* statement as to the magnitude of the energy, although, of course, the deviation implicitly determines the energy.

On the Decay of Isotropic Turbulence

S. CHANDRASEKHAR

Yerkes Observatory, University of Chicago, Williams Bay, Wisconsin
May 9, 1949

IN a recent letter¹ it was shown how Heisenberg's² theory of the decay of isotropic turbulence can be reduced to the discussion of a certain second order nonlinear differential equation for a function $g(y)$ related to the spectrum. The behavior

$$g(y) \sim [6y_0(y-y_0)]^{1/2}$$

of the solution as it cuts the y -axis described in that letter applies only to the right of y_0 and is accordingly not meaningful; to the left of y_0 , the behavior is given by

$$g(y) \sim 4(y_0 - y) + \frac{32}{3y_0}(y_0 - y)^{3/2} + \dots, \quad (y \rightarrow -y_0).$$

This corresponds to $f(x) \rightarrow \text{constant } x^{-7}$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ as required by Heisenberg.

I am indebted to Professor Heisenberg for correspondence which clarified the points at issue.

¹ S. Chandrasekhar, Phys. Rev. **75**, 1454 (1949).

² W. Heisenberg, Proc. Roy. Soc. **A195**, 402 (1948).

Correlations in Measurements on Superfluidity in Liquid Helium II*

JOHN R. PELLAM

Cryogenics Laboratory, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C.
May 9, 1949

IN three recent papers¹⁻³ V. Peshkov has published his latest researches in the field of second sound in liquid helium II. Since this work parallels in some respects portions of the results recently published by the writer⁴⁻⁶ a comparative summary is due at this point. This is particularly the case since these papers¹⁻³ by Peshkov are not generally available in translated form.^{***} Peshkov and the writer employ respectively the resonance and pulse methods, so that the mutual results well illustrate the complementary aspects of these two approaches.

A primary objective in each program^{5,6} was to establish the extreme low temperature behavior of the velocity of second sound. Both programs attained 1°K as a low temperature limit for these measurements. While complete experimental agreement was not forthcoming, the net results showed full substantiation of neither the theory of Tisza⁷ nor of Landau⁸ at the lowest temperatures. The pulse method⁶ revealed the same maximum of about 20.2 m/sec. at 1.65°K observed by Peshkov in his early resonance experiments.⁹ Both programs then evidenced a systematic decrease in velocity to minima near the lowest temperature extreme. Actually Peshkov³ further observed a slight increase at temperatures below his lowest velocity of 18.4 m/sec. at 1.12°K, whereas the writer's data⁶ indicate a flat minimum of 19.2 m/sec. down to 1°K (excluding in no way, however, a subsequent rise). These experimental differences cannot be considered as significant in attempting to choose between the two current theories.⁷⁻⁸

Investigations of various second-order effects have been made in both programs. Peshkov examined theoretically the effect of second sound extinction on resonance band widths, concentrating his experimental efforts² mainly on losses occurring at the solid walls of the resonant cavities used. The writer⁴⁻⁶ measured attenuation coefficients for video second sound pulses as a function of temperature, and found the attenuation to increase drastically near the λ -point.

Another second-order effect mutually examined was the breakdown of overdriven second sound. This particularly illustrates the complementary approaches of the two methods. The writer observed first sound generation accompanying second sound degeneration by exceeding critical counterflow velocities within the heat pulses.⁴⁻⁶ Conversely Peshkov detected an anomalous dip in the curve of observed second sound signal *versus* generator input.² The order-of-magnitude correlation**** between these results attained by opposite approaches is illustrated by Peshkov's critical heat flow density² of roughly 0.4×10^{-2} w/cm² and my value⁶ of about 1.0×10^{-2} w/cm² (0.0025 cal./cm² sec.).

In this connection Peshkov discusses² the high stability of second sound, persisting as it does under conditions favoring partial degeneration. Similarly second sound pulses were observed under conditions where partial conversion to first sound took place. The latter was observed to be limited,⁶ however, to within the first quarter millimeter from the thermal generator, so that the remaining second sound continued without further losses to this process.

Extending the parallelism, each of us predicted and apparently detected coupling between first and second sound instigated by the action of semi-impervious boundaries (acting differently toward the two fluid components because of their independent viscosity characteristics). Being primarily concerned with pulsing methods, the writer investigated theoretically¹⁰ the transformations between the two modes of propagation upon reflection from porous boundaries, and believes to have obtained evidence subsequently^{5,6} for this process. Consistent with the resonance method Peshkov succeeded in generating¹ simultaneously both first and second sound by vibrating a piston adjacent to a perforated screen. By means of this *filtration* method he observed proportions of first and second sound transmitted in general agreement with the boundary conditions presumed to hold.

The pulse method would seem to be somewhat more convenient than resonance techniques for observing⁶ quantitatively such phenomena as the Lane¹¹ type of conversion at the liquid helium II free surface. Similarly the low heat input fits it for extending velocity measurements to the adiabatic demagnetization range.

It is a privilege to call attention to the parallelisms and agreements displayed between the programs of Peshkov and the writer, and to have been able to substantiate and in some measure add to Peshkov's elegant work.

¹ V. P. Peshkov, J. Exper. Theor. Phys. U.S.S.R. **18**, 857 (1948).

² V. P. Peshkov, J. Exper. Theor. Phys. U.S.S.R. **18**, 867 (1948).

³ V. P. Peshkov, J. Exper. Theor. Phys. U.S.S.R. **18**, 951 (1948).

⁴ J. Pellam, M. I. T. Research Laboratory of Electronics Quarterly Progress Report, July 15 (1948).

⁵ J. Pellam, Phys. Rev. **74**, 841 (1948).

⁶ J. Pellam, Phys. Rev. **75**, 1183 (1949).

⁷ L. Tisza, J. de Phys. et rad. **1**, 165, 350 (1940); Phys. Rev. **72**, 838 (1947); also Phys. Rev. **75**, 885 (1949).

⁸ L. Landau, J. Phys. U.S.S.R. **5**, 71 (1941); J. Phys. U.S.S.R. **8**, 1 (1944); also Phys. Rev. **75**, 884 (1949).

⁹ V. Peshkov, J. Phys. **10**, 389 (1946).

¹⁰ J. Pellam, Phys. Rev. **73**, 608 (1948).

¹¹ Lane, Fairbank, Schultz, and Fairbank, Phys. Rev. **70**, 431 (1946); also Phys. Rev. **71**, 600 (1947).

* Supported by the ONR, Contract Na-onr 12-48.

** Summarized in reference 6.

*** We are indebted to Dr. P. M. Marcus of the ONR for making translated copies available to us; these arrived while the summary (reference 6) was in press.

**** Concerning the difference between these values, it is pointed out that some distortion may have resulted from the non-uniform heat flow density of the circularly symmetrical pulses used by the writer. Measurements are nearing completion here on overdriven second sound pulses of uniform heat flow density.

Erratum: The Infra-Red Spectrum and Molecular Constants of C¹²O¹⁶ and C¹³O¹⁶

[Phys. Rev. **72**, 284 (1947)]

ROBERT T. LAGEMANN,[†] ALVIN H. NIELSEN,^{††} AND FRED P. DICKEY
The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
May 11, 1949

AN error has recently been pointed out to the authors in Eqs. (13) and (14) which causes a numerical error in several of the constants in Table IV. The correct form of these equations is

$$x_e\omega_e = -\frac{1}{4}[6k_{1111} - 15(k_{111}^2/\omega_e)] \quad (13)$$

and

$$\alpha = -6(B_e/\omega_e)[B_e + k_{111}(2B_e/\omega_e)^{\frac{1}{2}}]. \quad (14)$$

The correct values of the affected constants in Table IV are:

$$\begin{aligned} k_{111} &= -123.79 \text{ cm}^{-1}, & k_{111}' &= -119.68 \text{ cm}^{-1}, \\ k_{1111} &= 8.84 \text{ cm}^{-1}, & k_{1111}' &= 8.45 \text{ cm}^{-1}, \\ x_e\omega_e' &= 12.68 \text{ cm}^{-1} \text{ (calc.)}^{***} & \omega_e' &= 2121.41 \text{ cm}^{-1} \text{ (calc.)}^* \\ \alpha' &= 0.0164 \text{ cm}^{-1} \text{ (calc.)}^{****} \end{aligned}$$

[†] Emory University, Emory University, Georgia.

^{††} The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee.

Addendum: Energy Spectrum of the Decay Particles and the Mass and Spin of the Mesotron

[Phys. Rev. **75**, 1432 (1949)]

ROBERT B. LEIGHTON, CARL D. ANDERSON, AND AARON J. SERIFF
California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California
May 16, 1949

THE decay electrons originating in the copper-walled Geiger counter show a much greater ratio of negative to positive electrons (4 neg. and 8 pos.) than one would expect from mesotrons stopping in copper, where nuclear capture of a negative mesotron is highly probable. The high proportion of negative electrons observed is explained by the fact that a portion of the counter assembly contained beeswax in which some of the mesotrons may have decayed.