cannot be explained by a longer relaxation time in these fields. (With $\mu_2=0.5\ \mu_1$ the maximum discrepancy could be 15 percent instead of the observed factor 3.) The small increase in μ_1 below 6.25 oersteds could be entirely due to magnetization by rotation of the spin directions. We therefore conclude that *at* 200 mc *magnetization by the displacement of domain boundary walls is greatly reduced and is almost wholly out of phase with the magnetizing field, and that magnetization by rotation is the dominant effect.*

This investigation is being extended to other materials and to other wave-lengths.

[1] Abstracts L4 and L5, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc., Jan. 30, 1947.
[2] We are indebted to Mr. R. A. Chegwidden of the Bell Telephone Laboratories for samples of several magnetic materials.
[3] In practice the frequency is held constant and the resonant wave-length of the cavity altered linearly by displacing a dielectric bead.
[4] We are much indebted to Mr. E. A. Gaugler of the Naval Ordnance Laboratory for the preliminary measurements of d.c. incremental permeability shown in Fig. 2.

A Defense of the Cauchy Relations

CLARENCE ZENER
Institute for the Study of Metals, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois
February 5, 1947

EPSTEIN[1] has recently presented a theoretical analysis of the Cauchy relations between the coefficients of elasticity. From this analysis he concludes that the assumption of central forces does not necessarily lead to relations of the Cauchy type, and implies that the failure of the Cauchy relations in particular lattices has no theoretical significance. The purpose of the present letter is to point out that the Cauchy relations do follow when in addition to the assumption of central forces we assume that each atom is at a center of symmetry of the lattice. Since many metals and salts satisfy this symmetry condition, namely simple cubic, face centered cubic, and body centered cubic crystal structures, a failure of the Cauchy relation between their coefficients of elasticity is of theoretical significance, namely this failure implies that all the forces are not of the central type acting along lines joining lattice points.

The proof that the Cauchy relation follows from the above two assumptions has been given by Love.[2] An alternative proof is in fact furnished by Epstein's own analysis. Epstein shows that the correct relations are identical with the Cauchy relations save for the presence of certain expression of the type

$$v_{jk}=\Sigma_{\mu\nu}A_{\mu\nu}a_{\mu\nu j}a_{\mu\nu k},$$

where the symbols in the right member are defined in reference 1. The above expression may be written in the more familiar form

$$v_{jk}=\tfrac{1}{2}\Sigma_{\mu\nu}l_{\mu\nu}m_{\mu\nu}a_{\mu\nu}\phi'(a_{\mu\nu}),$$

where $l_{\mu\nu}$ and $m_{\mu\nu}$ are the direction cosines of the vector passing from the lattice point μ to the lattice point ν, referred to the j and k axes, respectively. Love[2] has given a very simple interpretation to this second expression for v_{jk} in the case of central forces when each atom is at a center of symmetry; namely, he has shown that aside from a multiplicative constant, v_{jk} is simply jk, the stress acting across a plane normal to the j axis in the direction of the k axis. Under these two conditions the Cauchy relations are therefore valid, provided the specimen is under no initial stress.

[1] Paul S. Epstein, Phys. Rev. **70**, 915 (1946).
[2] A. E. H. Love, *Mathematical Theory of Elasticity* (Cambridge University Press, 1906), second edition, p. 535.

The Upper Energy Limit of the K^{40} Beta-Ray Spectrum

W. J. HENDERSON
National Research Council, Ottawa, Canada
February 8, 1947

KONOPINSKI[1] has discussed the disintegration on K^{40} in terms of the selection rules, which are assumed to hold during the beta-decay. The nuclear transition involved is a highly forbidden one, and therefore interesting from the theoretical point of view. However, no decision could be made between the Gamow-Teller and Fermi selection rules because of the conflicting experimental values for the upper limit of the spectrum. For this reason it is felt that a fuller account of my measurements[2] of the upper limit may be of interest.

The measurements were made by the absorption method wherein the absorption of the K^{40} beta-rays in copper was compared with the absorption of radium E and uranium X_2 beta-rays under the same experimental conditions. Since the activity of potassium is very small, a large solid angle and a sensitive detector are required. A cylindrical Geiger-Müller counter of diameter 1.7 cm and length 5 cm of Dow-metal wall, of 0.0354 g/cm² was surrounded by a cylinder of KCl, of inner diameter 3.2 cm and 2.3 cm thick. In this arrangement the initial count, with only the counter walls absorbing, was 500 per minute. The absorption curve obtained by dropping copper tubes over the counter is shown in Fig. 1. After the beta-rays have been stopped at a range of 0.375 g/cm² of copper, there remains a constant background due to the gamma-radiation of energy 2.0×10^6 volts emitted[3] by potassium, with an intensity of 3 quanta per 100 disintegrating potassium atoms.

With the ordinary radioactive bodies, where the intensity is much greater, it is customary to use some empirical relation[4,5] to calculate the upper energy limit from the range or the absorption coefficient. Such a procedure is not permissible in the case of potassium because of the low initial activity, and the range 0.375 g/cm² must be corrected by comparison with other radioactive bodies where the energy distribution is known. The measurements were therefore repeated using identical sized sources of radium E and U_3O_8 mixed with NaCl as filler to make up the same mass per unit area as the KCl source. In each case the strength was adjusted so that the initial intensity was approximately the same as the KCl—i.e., 500 counts per minute. The radium E and uranium X_2 curves are included in Fig. 1. From these absorption curves the apparent ranges of the radium E and uranium X_2 beta-rays are 0.310 g/cm² and 0.865 g/cm², respectively. The correct ranges of the beta-rays from these bodies are very well known,[6-8] and are 0.475 g/cm² and 1.10 g/cm². It is apparent that the ranges measured with low intensity sources are too small, and the usual relations cannot be used to