of three terms, all of which can be obtained from any one by cyclic permutation. If we restrict our attention to one of these terms V_{12}, we see that it depends only on the spins of the two nucleons 1, 2 whose world lines contain no pairs. The spin-orbit corrections involve only the spin of the third nucleon. The spin-orbit corrections of lowest order are contained in the expression

$$(2M)^{-2}[\boldsymbol{\sigma}_3\cdot(\nabla_{31}V_{12})\times\mathbf{p}_3+\boldsymbol{\sigma}_3\cdot(\nabla_{32}V_{12})\times\mathbf{p}_3]$$

and its cyclic permutations.

In the case of all diagrams, except (d) and (f), V is a function only of $|\mathbf{r}_i-\mathbf{r}_j|$. Then

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i\cdot(\nabla_{ij}V)\times\mathbf{p}_i=\frac{1}{r_{ij}}\frac{dV}{dr_{ij}}\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i\cdot\mathbf{L}_i,$$

which shows the spin-orbit coupling explicitly.

The level splittings between states of $j=l-\frac{1}{2}$ and states of $j=l+\frac{1}{2}$ of a single nucleon outside a closed shell can be estimated,[6] and are of the order of 1 Mev or smaller, and of both signs.[7] This is an order of magnitude too small to fulfill the requirements of the shell model. Moreover, there seem to be no indications that consideration of many-nucleon forces involving more than three nucleons, or consideration of two- and three-nucleon forces of high order in the coupling constant, will supply the spin-orbit interaction postulated by the shell model. It should be pointed out that divergent diagrams have been consistently neglected in this investigation. Also, many spin-dependent terms which are not of the form of spin-orbit potentials have been discarded. These factors may possibly affect the level splitting significantly. For example, effects of the tensor force, corresponding to certain reducible diagrams and arising from second and higher orders in ordinary perturbation theory, may be responsible for the splitting.[8] The approximate equality of the splittings due to diagrams (a), (b), (d), (e), (f), and (g) raises the question of convergence[9] and casts doubt on the validity of the whole procedure.

It is a pleasure for the author to acknowledge his gratitude to Dr. F. Rohrlich for suggesting this problem, and for many interesting and stimulating discussions. His thanks are also due Dr. A. Klein for a copy of his unpublished manuscript, and for an interesting correspondence.

[1] M. M. Lévy, Phys. Rev. **88**, 72, 725 (1952).
[2] A. Klein, Phys. Rev. (to be published).
[3] This author has independently calculated the uncorrected three-nucleon potentials arising from diagrams (d), (e), and (f) by the Tamm-Dancoff method. The results agree with those of Klein, reference 2.
[4] M. M. Lévy (private communication).
[5] We use units of $\hbar=c=1$.
[6] For the purpose of numerical estimates we choose $G^2/4\pi=10$.
[7] The level splitting vanishes for diagram (d) on account of its spin dependence.
[8] A. Feingold, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton University (unpublished).
[9] A. Klein, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. **28**, No. 3, 36 (1953).

Radioactive Charging through a Dielectric Medium*

E. G. LINDER AND P. RAPPAPORT
Laboratories Division, Radio Corporation of America, Princeton, New Jersey
(Received April 7, 1953)

A STUDY has been made of a process of electrostatic charging in which charged particles pass from a radioactive emitter through a dielectric to a collector. Particular attention has been given to the role played by the dielectric. The process of charging through a vacuum has been discussed in previous publications.[1-3]

If a layer of dielectric F (in Fig. 1) is sandwiched between an electrode S, emitting beta-rays, and an electrode P, acting as a collector, radiation from S will pass through F and charge P negatively, leaving S positive. A voltage will be developed across terminals T. Such a device may be represented by an equivalent circuit consisting of a constant current source of output i_0, representing the radioactive material, in parallel with the capacitance C of the device, and in parallel with its internal resistance and any other resistance which might be connected across terminals



FIG. 1. Schematic diagram showing radioactive source S, dielectric separator F, and collector P.

T. The initial rate of charge is i_0/C. The final equilibrium voltage is Ri_0. These relations have been verified experimentally. Sr90–Y90 sources of effectively 2 millicuries and 54 millicuries were used. The dielectric was polystyrene.

Current-voltage characteristics, made with a 10^{-11} ampere charging current indicated that a maximum voltage of about 3700 could be reached. The internal resistance was found to correspond to a specific resistance for polystyrene of 7×10^{15} ohm-cm. Unbombarded values are given in the literature ranging from 10^{18} to 10^{22}. This decrease is attributed to bombardment-induced conductivity of the polystyrene. With a 2.5×10^{-10} ampere charging current the maximum voltage was determined to be about 6600, and the corresponding specific resistance 0.5×10^{15} ohm-cm, a decrease by a factor of 14 from the former value.

Measurements of the effect of varying the dielectric thickness showed an optimum thickness which yielded maximum charging rate. Charge soakage effects were observed, the charge rate and voltage developed being affected by previous radioactive charging. Backscattering of electrons was found to reduce the charging current. From this reduction backscattering coefficients were calculated as follows: 0.49 for lead, 0.31 for tin, 0.25 for silver, 0.17 for copper, 0.09 for aluminum, and 0.04 for carbon. These are in satisfactory agreement with values found by Trump and Van de Graaff.[4] A discussion of the experiments and their results will be published in detail at a later date.

The apparatus and techniques used in this study seem to offer a new and simple method of studying such effects as bombardment-induced conductivity, secondary emission, charge soakage, radiation absorption, and other effects of radiation on solids.

The work described here was suggested by the possibility of making a radioactive voltage or current source. Such a source could possess the advantages of long life, stability, and simplicity of construction. It is believed that it might find considerable application in the electronics field.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. M. J. Cohen of these Laboratories and to Professor M. G. White of Princeton University for many valuable discussions.

* This work was supported in large part by the Components and Systems Laboratory, Wright Air Development Center, Air Research and Development Command, United States Air Force.
[1] E. G. Linder, Phys. Rev. **71**, 129 (1947).
[2] E. G. Linder and S. M. Christian, Phys. Rev. **83**, 233 (1951).
[3] E. G. Linder and S. M. Christian, J. Appl. Phys. (to be published).
[4] J. G. Trump and R. J. Van de Graaff, Phys. Rev. **75**, 44 (1949); also J. G. Trump, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Progress Report, January, 1951, pp. 14–15 (unpublished).

Origin of the "Strong-Focusing" Principle*

E. D. COURANT, M. S. LIVINGSTON,† H. S. SNYDER, AND J. P. BLEWETT
Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York
(Received April 27, 1953)

AFTER our proposal for strong-focusing accelerators[1,2] had been published, our attention was called to an unpublished manuscript by N. Christophilos, entitled "Focussing System for Ions and Electrons and Application in Magnetic Resonance Particle Accelerators." In this paper Christophilos proposes an accelerator which incorporates strong focusing, using a sinusoidal variation of the field gradient with azimuth rather than the stepwise variation considered by us. He points out, as did we, that by this method the size of the magnet for the accelerator can be reduced very considerably as compared to constant-gradient focusing. He also discusses the change in the mechanism of phase stability mentioned in our paper and the possibility of using this focusing method in linear systems.

Since Christophilos' manuscript is known to have been prepared in early 1950, it is obvious that his proposal antedates ours by over two years. We are, therefore, happy to acknowledge his priority.

* Work performed under the auspices of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

† Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

[1] Courant, Livingston, and Snyder, Phys. Rev. **88**, 1190 (1952).
[2] J. P. Blewett, Phys. Rev. **88**, 1197 (1952).

PHYSICAL REVIEW VOLUME 91, NUMBER 1 JULY 1, 1953

Proceedings of the American Physical Society

Minutes of the 1953 March Meeting Held at Durham and Chapel Hill, North Carolina, March 26–27–28, 1953

(Corresponding to Bulletin of the American Physical Society, Volume 28, No. 2)

THE 1953 March meeting of the American Physical Society was held on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, March 26, 27, and 28, in North Carolina: on Thursday and Friday in the buildings of Duke University at Durham, on Saturday in those of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Nine hundred people registered, making this the largest March meeting in the history of the Society as well as one of the most pleasant. The Division of High-Polymer Physics and the Division of Solid-State Physics made this the annual meeting of each, and arranged for it a considerable number of symposia and of invited papers separate from the symposia. The Southeastern Section of the Society made this its 1953 Meeting, providing a symposium and gathering a large number of ten-minute papers: it should be also mentioned that the ten-minute papers in high-polymer physics were collected by the Division of that name. The Division of Chemical Physics organized a symposium. The predominance of nonnuclear physics was attenuated by ten-minute papers in nuclear physics contributed spontaneously and by invited papers solicited in the main from Southeastern laboratories.

The weather was ideal during the meeting, but those who flew from the Northeast on the preceding night found it otherwise. One is accustomed to laborious and efficient Local Committees, but the aides of the North Carolina Committee set an all-time record in self-sacrifice: three ladies sat up all of the Wednesday night in the lobby of the Washington-Duke Hotel at Durham to make sure that those who arrived in the small hours by belated planes should find accommodations waiting for them! The size of the attendance made it necessary to open dormitories of Duke University to our members. Buses were provided to take our members and guests between Durham and Chapel Hill on all of the days of the meeting, and even between the hotels and the University in Durham. The members of the Local Committee were Eugene Greuling (Chairman), H. W. Lewis and W. Fairbank of Duke University, and W. A. Bowers and J. W. Straley of the University of North Carolina. The names of all of those who helped them would probably cover an entire page.

The banquet of the Society was held on Friday evening in the Duke Union, with an attendance of nearly five hundred. The after-dinner program was offered in the Page Auditorium and consisted of speeches by Vice-President P. M. Gross of Duke University and our colleagues T. J. Killian, R. J. Seeger, and W. Shockley. The demonstrations which were a part of Mr. Shockley's talk continued until past eleven, setting probably an all-time record for the duration of an after-dinner programme of the Society. Nobody left beforehand.

The Council met briefly on Thursday morning. It elected to Fellowship twenty-four candidates and to Membership one hundred and seventy-four candidates: their names follow.

Elected To Fellowship: G. C. Baldwin, H. P. Broida, J. K. Bragg, F. P. Bundy, E. F. Cox, F. L. Friedman, P. F. Gast, M. L. Herlin, J. P. Howe, Henry Hurwitz, R. S. Jessup, W. L. Kraushaar, E. Maxwell, H. M. Parker, J. R. Pellam, W. R. Perret, H. F. Schiefer, R. B. Scott, M. W. P. Strandberg, David Turnbull, R. T. Weidmer, F. E. Williams, R. E. Wilson, and B. H. Zimm.

Elected to Membership: Robert S. Allgaier, Nissim Almeleh, Kinsey A. Anderson, Yasusi Ataka, Richard E. Azuma, David D. Babb, Michel Bader, [s]Alan H. Barrett, Bernhard E. Bartels, Joseph J. Becker, Richard L. Becker, Robert R. Berlot, Anne L. Blevins, Maurice E. Blevins, [s]Richard J. Blume, William L. Briscoe, Allen Brodsky, Sybrand Broersma, Glenn L. Brown, Paul P. Budenstein, Paolo Budini, William R. Busing, Guy H. Cain, Jr., Helen D. Callaway, [s]Frans A. Cerulus, William E. Claxton, Russell L. Collins, Joseph F. Colwell, Charles J. Cook, Robert P. Cox, Thomas D. Crumley, Basil Curnutte, Jr., Emlyn B. Davies, Charles F. Davis, Jr., Joseph E. Davis, Joseph M. Denney, James P. Dietz, Paul L. Donoho, William T. Doyle, Richard E. Durand, [s]Thomas G. Eck, John O. Erkman, [s]Marshall P. Ernstene, Leonard R.