



NATIONAL RADIO ASTRONOMY OBSERVATORY

1000 BULLOCK BOULEVARD, N.W. POST OFFICE BOX O SOCORRO, NEW MEXICO 87801
TELEPHONE 505 835 2924 TWX 910 988 1710 VLA SITE 505 772 4011

11 January 1982

Dear Roger,

Your note re our IC708 paper was here when I returned to the VLA today. I am sorry if Jacques, Andrew and I misunderstood what you were getting at in your letter of March 11. In fact all three of us read it to say that the coordinate system defined in the figure in your Nature article was not the one you had used when deriving the formulae, and thus that you were confirming our suspicion that a typographical error had occurred. Several people who had seen our draft commented that they had been puzzled by the resulting discrepancies in the Nature article and that reworking the basic relations as we did in our Appendix clarified the problem for them. I can appreciate that it must be aggravating to have such a situation cleared by Nature's policy on labelling Figures - I have been annoyed by this in the past myself (and remember seeing a diagram labelled "RA" and "December" there once!). Unfortunately though, the coordinate system in the Nature article was defined entirely by the figure itself, so readers of the paper were left to rework the formulae in order to guess what had happened. In that context we felt that reworking them in the published coordinate system in our Appendix would be helpful to some readers, and your March 11 letter actually confirmed our belief that this would be worthwhile. I am sorry if the letter was actually intended to ask us not to do this, for that was not the meaning any of us drew from it. Please be assured that we did not mean to imply any criticism of the scientific content of the Nature article.

With best wishes,

OPERATED BY ASSOCIATED UNIVERSITIES, INC.,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91125

THEORETICAL ASTROPHYSICS 130-33

TELEPHONE (213) 356-4597

Dear Alan,

I have just seen your paper in IC708. Note that you still say our formula is wrong. I wrote to you on March 11 about this, but you perhaps did not receive the letter. I enclose a copy. If you did receive it, allow me to express (very slight) irritation because I think you have confused the issue. I don't whether or not we were to blame for the mislabelling $X \leftrightarrow Y$, but this is a problem has arisen before as Nature requires submitted diagrams to be unlabelled!

I'm glad to hear that you are coming to Caltech to give a talk.

Best wishes,

Roger.

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91125

THEORETICAL ASTROPHYSICS 130-33

TELEPHONE (213) 795-6811

March 11.

Dear Alan,

Just a brief note about your paper with Vallee.
(Begelman, Rees, and I)

You say we gave the wrong formula for the bending of
the trail. In fact the formula is correct and
equivalent to yours, the diagram was mislabelled!
I apologise further that it did not cause you
too much extra work. Otherwise I thought the paper read
very well and agree that ballistic jet dynamics are
very unlikely to explain the observed slope.

Thank you again for organising the Albuquerque
meeting.

Best wishes

Roger.