

On Her Majesty's Service

WASC 594-599

Inclusive

WASC 594-599

Museum

~~ITEM VOIT~~

WAC 596

Explosives Laboratory opens
its doors.

New Scientist

20 June 1968.

pulsars. Previously, Sir Martin had tentatively identified pulsar CP 1919 with a weak blue star. At the Goddard meeting two independent researchers reported detecting periodic fluctuations in the light intensity from this source. One was Dr David Cudaback of California University, working with a team at the Lick Observatory; the other Dr Steven Maran of Kitt Peak National Observatory (*New Scientist*, Vol.38, p.446). The light was extremely faint, and careful statistical techniques were called for in the search for periodicities.

The odd thing about the results from these two observatories was that though the light seemed to be varying by some four per cent of its strength it was doing so at only half the frequency of the radio emissions.

Dr Cudaback, however, has now retracted his statement, saying that the Lick Observatory conclusion was entirely spurious, the result of undetected "wow" in the tape-recorder used. The experiment demanded lengthy recording of electronic observations of the star, followed by a computer search of the tapes for signs of the likely periodicity. "Wow" is simply an inherent periodicity in a faulty tape-recorder.

After some 20 hours of observing time, however, the Kitt Peak astronomers are still convinced that the pulsar optical fluctuations are real; though some 14 hours' work on the 200-inch reflector at Mount Palomar have given a negative result. It certainly seems hard to explain an optical rate of half the radio periodicity.

Explosives laboratory opens its doors

With a set-piece that showered visiting photographers with water, the Explosives Research and Development Establishment last week made the point that some of its most interesting research concerned underwater explosions. The occasion was the first ever open day of the establishment, near Waltham Abbey, in Essex. The origins of this ancient facility are, to quote the guidebook, "largely a matter of conjecture and legend," but the abbey was certainly known for gunpowder as far back as 1561. Current work is more concerned with rocket propellants than explosives, and perhaps a third of the effort relates directly to neither. For example, the search for a strong material for rocket cases has given rise to a study of fibre-reinforced metals and plastics which has now taken off under its own power (as it were), to become one of the main reasons why ERDE (now taken over by the Ministry of Technology) should be known about by industry.

But within the field of explosives, there is still progress to be made in the design of substances that will have the greatest possible impact under water. These are not necessarily just the most powerful explosives. While the amount of energy released per gramme of explosive remains important, it would appear that the "impulse"—which depends on the rate at which the energy is released—may be equally so. Very often, the greatest effect is obtained in water not with a bang but a "heave". The same will probably be true of the materials that will be needed when undersea continental shelves begin to be mined.

So, with the ultimate aim of being able to supply an explosive tailored to a particular need, an arrangement for exactly measuring underwater explosions has been set up at ERDE. An immersed piezoelectric pressure sensor records the pattern of the shock-wave in quite fine detail, from which the effective energy and impulse of the "bomb" can be deduced. It is hoped that a reproducible standard technique will be arrived at along these lines. It was this system that was demonstrated last week for the not unmixed benefit of the cameramen.

Making new explosive mixtures for testing—the other end of this type of research—remains the same sort of risky business it has been ever since Chinese Taoist monks, around AD 900, burned their beards discovering gunpowder. An impressive remote-handling plant has been completed recently at ERDE, incorporating a five-inch gauge model railway. The experimental oxidizers, fuels and binders (binders, separating and protecting the constituents, are under particularly active research) are wheeled to the mixer, mixed in vacuum, moulded, cured, and packed into test "rounds", trundled across a field to one of a range of enclosures, and exploded, all behind a sufficient thickness of concrete to stand up to the accidental detonation of 15lb of TNT.

This figure defines the capacity of the plant: that is, on the borderline between the laboratory scale and the manufacturing scale. It is thus not only a remotely controlled laboratory, but in fact a small-scale trial production rig, which can simply be scaled up to provide the designer of a production line with most of the data he needs.



How fallible can you get?

Last week Professors Lew Kowarski and Francis Perrin, two pioneers of nuclear research, were in Washington for the presentation of a special \$35 000 prize by the US Atomic Energy Commission's chairman Glenn T. Seaborg. The prize was awarded in recognition of the outstanding contribution made to the development of nuclear energy by themselves and two other scientists (now dead), Frédéric Joliot and Hans Halban. Yet in April 1951 the same Lew Kowarski, at that time in charge of the physics division of the French Atomic Energy Commission, was quoted as saying: "In 1975 atomic power may become a practical running possibility, but not until AD 2000 is it likely to challenge classical methods and then only if the power stations are on an international scale." Sir John Cockcroft said, at the same time, "One major difficulty bedevils the work of the nuclear engineer—the radioactivity which is produced along with the development of heat. Safe

disposal or storage may prove to be costly and difficult".

Forecasting the future is a chancy business and forecasting the future of science and technology is possibly the chanciest. The remarks were made in an article on the future of nuclear power in the now dead magazine, *Picture Post*. It is extraordinary to read now, less than 20 years on into the future that the scientists were trying to penetrate. The Russians and Americans fared no better. According to the article Professor Peter Kapitza believed that atomic energy would not become a factor in peacetime application for 50 to 100 years. Lawrence Hafstad, in charge of reactor development for the US Atomic Energy Commission, is quoted as saying that nuclear power would cost "a megabuck per megawatt".

The more positive a statement made about the future, the more it seems to be shaky. For example, the article breaks into italics to emphasize this. "There is no question that the idea of producing a few immense atomic power plants to supply large districts or even whole countries is a dream not likely to be realized until the next century." The whole of human activity proves, almost without exception, something about which there is no question going to be questioned and usually in the short order. The paradox about such pronouncements is that they may, and usually are, made by scientists (when they are not made by politicians), who, by their nature and training are questioning and cautious. Rutherford's conviction that there was no possible practical value in atomic research is well known.

The points in the *Picture Post* article of course, made honestly on the basis of information available at that time. Some of them, too, are palpable hits. "There seems a little point in considering atomic fuel for liners yet, since other fuels are plentiful." Atom-driven ships would certainly have to be specially designed and would have no advantage over present vessels and their building would be prohibitive." There goes *Savannah*. But the general wrongness of forecasting by people in the know is astonishing. Enrico Fermi, also quoted, says, "I believe it is very desirable that the public should not think that atomic power is round the corner because, if they do so, they are in disillusionment. I believe that it would be a great disservice to engender unjustified hopes."

Obviously, there was great pessimism about nuclear energy's future because the terror of atomic bombs on Japan had bitten deep. But this proves that past events cast much more tectable shadows than coming ones.

New mining complex to surpass Magnetogorsk

The region of the Kursk magnetic anomaly, estimated iron ore deposits of thousands of millions of tons, is due to be developed into the largest ore mining centre in the Soviet Union according to a recent TASS report from Moscow. It is to be far larger than the famous Magnetogorsk complex in the Urals, which was built up from nothing in the 1930s.

The Kursk anomaly is situated in Central Russia.