ERRATA

DISCHARGE NUCLEAR POLARIZATION IN He^3 GAS. Gene H. McCall and Thomas R. Carver [Phys. Rev. Letters 19, 485 (1967)].

The actual drawings of Figs. 1 and 2 in this article have been interchanged, and since there are four captioned curves in each drawing, considerable confusion results. However, the captions and references in the text are correct if the reader will look at Fig. 2 while reading the captions of Fig. 1 and vice versa.

DISLOCATION DRAG IN METALS. G. P. Huffman and N. P. Louat [Phys. Rev. Letters 19, 518 (1967)].

Our original calculation has been (a) refined by using a more general deformation potential whose Fourier transform has the form $V_{D\vec{q}} = -(2E_F q/3\omega)\{\gamma_{\vec{q}} u_{\vec{q}\parallel} + \beta_{\vec{q}} u_{\vec{q}\perp}\}$, and (b) corrected through the retention of terms of order $\omega\tau$ in the conductivity tensor. The previous calculation was equivalent to putting $\gamma_{\vec{q}} = 1$ and $\beta_{\vec{q}} = 0$ which is fairly reasonable for $q \lesssim q_D/10$. For the short wavelength components of the dislocation wave packet, however, electronic screening is incomplete and the continuum expressions for the atomic displacements are inaccurate; thus, for $q \gtrsim q_D/10$, $\gamma_{\vec{q}} < 1$ and one expects that $0 < \beta_{\vec{q}} \ll \gamma_{\vec{q}}$. Using a simple Thomas-Fermi model[1] to describe the effect of incomplete screening, the dominant term in the stress is given by Eq. (10) multiplied by a factor of order 0.1, and the subsequent analysis is essentially unchanged. It became apparent in the course of this work that the neglect of terms of order $\omega\tau$ in the previous calculation was invalid. Moreover, inclusion of these terms in the previous model eliminates the term $(q_D\Lambda)^{2/3}$ in Eq. (9). Details will be discussed elsewhere.

[1]J. M. Ziman, Electrons and Phonons (Oxford University Press, London, England, 1963).