AUG 19 1974

Dear Harriet

Thank you for the Mulkay - Edge piece. As you would predict I find the barely mentioned prehistory (1902-1930) [pp. 25-26] the most interesting. I think I have read some other accounts - perhaps including Jansky's own retrospectives - and will try to find them, as well as write to the authors for the fuller account which may say more about the earlier period.

My notice in sending this now is to raise the question whether Jansky 1930 was post-mature [vis a vis 1902] or pre-mature [vis-a-vis] Reber 1940 or both or is it an example of any discontinuity? The discouraging implication of Planck is not commented (page 25); and I have to see whether Jansky perceived his own findings as anti "paradigmatic", or merely the fruit of better equipment or more complex models of the sun. Some of your colleagues at Columbia — but no one better than Von Eshleman could quickly answer these points: I will ask Von.

P.S. As some of the marginal notes hint, the technical problems of observational astronomy have made it one of the most pervasively socialized of scientific disciplines — but each of the sciences is a special case!

Solo

But I have to say "no" to the specific marginal questions top p. 34. Example, "theoretical" prediction followed by observation of Neptune contra that of Vulcan. At cosmological level, see Hoyle on predictions of density of universe at visible frontiers.