matters arising

Dynamic measurement of matter creation and Earth expansion

RITTER et al.1 have attributed to me the argument that continuous creation of matter where matter is already most dense at a rate of 7×10^{-18} g g⁻¹ s⁻¹ can ac count for the growth of the mass of the Earth $(6 \times 10^{27} \text{ g})$ in a time of $4.5 \times 10^9 \text{ yr}$. This is certainly numerically the case (ignoring the fact that the mass of the proto-Earth in the early stages would have been small and the creation rate correspondingly low). However, in the paper of mine which they quote², I pointed out (on page 54) that the observed upper limit on continuous creation (of Cohen and King3) of 4×10^{-23} g g⁻¹ s⁻¹ seems to rule out such a process. In order to remove doubt, it should be pointed out that the continuous creation hypothesis for the origin of the Earth will only be plausible if the experiment described by Ritter et al.1 disproves the results of that of Cohen and King3.

The continuous creation rate of 7×10^{-18} g g⁻¹ s⁻¹ is that given by the condition that the Universe be in a steady state4,5. It is indeed a remarkable coincidence that this creation rate can account for the Earth's mass with its known geological age (T_E) ; but it should be appreciated that what this coincidence means is that the timescale $T_{\rm E}$ is

$$T_{\rm E} \approx 1/(7 \times 10^{-18}) \approx T_{\rm U} \approx H^{-1}$$
 (1)

where $T_{\rm U}$ is the 'age' of the Universe, which is believed to be of the order of the reciprocal of Hubble's parameter H. But the rate of expansion of the Earth at about 0.5 mm yr -1, which is apparently observed² and which is remarked on by Ritter et al.1 (in connection with continuous creation) also has another possible explanation: as pointed out some time ago6, if one puts the radius of the Earth $R_{\rm E}$ into the Hubble formula one finds

$$R_{\rm E} \approx H R_{\rm E} \approx 0.5 \,\,{\rm mm}\,{\rm yr}^{-1}$$
 (2)

with $R_{\rm E} \approx 6,370$ km and H equal to the cosmological value of 75 km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹ $(= 2.5 \times 10^{-18} \text{ s}^{-1})$. The coincidence, equation (2), seems to be at least equally as impressive as equation (1), and suggests that the expansion of the Universe may in some way be coupled to smaller systems7. If a system expands in this manner, whether as a response to continuous creation or some other process, the resultant change in the angular velocity of the system should be open to test using the experiment described by Ritter et al.1.

PAUL WESSON

St Johns College, Cambridge University, Cambridge, UK

- Ritter, R. C., Gillies, G. T., Rood, R. T. & Beams, J. W. Nature 271, 228-229 (1978).
 Wesson, P. S. Q. Jl R. astr. Soc. 14, 9-64 (1973).
 Cohen, S. A. & King, J. G. Nature 222, 1158-1159 (1960)
- (1969).
- (1969).
 McCrea, W. H. Endeavor 9, 3-10 (1950).
 Bondi, H. Cosmology 143; 149 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1952).
 MacDougall, J., Butler, R., Kronberg, P. & Sandqvist, A. Nature 199, 1080 (1963).
 Wesson, P. S. Cosmology and Geophysics (Hilger, Bristol, in the press).

Do compact radio sources contain non-relativistic plasma?

THERE has been considerable discussion¹⁻³ of multifrequency polarisation measurements of compact variable radio sources. These measurements^{4,5} indicate that the synchrotron radiation emitted by compact sources has undergone no significant amount of Faraday depolarisation. It has been argued¹⁻³ that these data imply that such radio sources contain no non-relativistic plasma. It is, therefore, concluded that radio source models6-8 which rely on plasma turbulence in a non-relativistic background plasma for particle acceleration are inapplicable.

We wish to point out first, that these limitations actually apply only to the presence of non-relativistic electrons, and that Faraday depolarisation observations are insensitive to the presence of protons or other massive particles whether they are relativistic or not. (Faraday rotation due to 'cold' protons is a factor $m_{\rm p}^2/m_{\rm e}^2 \sim 3 \times 10^6$ less than that due to non-relativistic electrons.) In fact, the observations are consistent with the non-relativistic proton density which is more than 10⁴ times greater than the density of observed, relativistic electrons, and statements³ that the compact sources contain 'no non-relativistic matter' are, therefore, completely unjustified. Furthermore, the data of Wardle² seem to indicate source temperatures of the order of 10¹² K. At this temperature the thermal electrons would be expected to be relativistic, as observed, but the thermal protons would be nonrelativistic ($\gamma_p = E_p/m_pc^2 \sim 1.2$). Theoretical considerations also indicate[®], in agreement with Wardle's observations, that 1012 K is a natural upper limit to the proton temperature as pion production cooling acts as a natural thermostat mechanism and precludes higher temperatures.

It, therefore, seems likely that the internal energy state and dynamics of compact sources are dominated by a non-relativistic proton plasma. Thus, we also disagree with the previous contentions¹⁻³ that those source models are inapplicable which invoke nonrelativistic plasma turbulence as a particle acceleration mechanism. Some models⁶ rely on electron-supported electrostatic plasma turbulence, and the lack of non-relativistic electrons in compact sources does seem to rule out such theories (see ref. 3). However, models dealing with non-relativistic hydrodynamic turbulent acceleration⁸ (such as statistical Fermi acceleration), Alfvénic turbulent⁷ acceleration, or combinations thereof¹⁰ are consistent with observations, as these types of turbulence are all supported by the background non-relativistic proton plasma.

The absence of Faraday depolarisation of the radiation from compact radio sources cannot, therefore, be used to determine the internal energy state of such sources, and models of compact sources including nonrelativistic plasma turbulent particle acceleration agree with observations.

JOHN S. SCOTT

Astronomy Program, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742

WAYNE A. CHRISTIANSEN

Physics Department, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

- Ledden, J. E. & Aller, H. D. Am. Ass. adv. Sci. Bull. 9, 335 (1977).
 Wardle, J. F. C. Nature 269, 563 (1977).
 Jones, T. W. & O'Dell, S. L. Astr. Astrophys. (in the press).
 Altschuler, D. R. & Wardle, J. F. C. Mon. Nat. R. astr. Soc 82, 1 (1976).
 Conway, R. G. et al. Mon. Not. R. astr. Soc. 168, 127 (1974).
 Tsytovich, V. N. & Checkhackev, A. S. Soviet Astr. J. 13, 385 (1969).
 Lacombe, C. Astr. Astrophys. 54, 7 (1977).
 Pacholczyk, A. G. & Scott, J. S. & Vestrand, W. T. Astrophys. J. (in the press).
 Scott, J. S., Cocke, W. J., Chevalier, R. A. & Wentzel, D. W. Astrophys. Space Sci. (in the press). the press).

WARDLE REPLIES-I do not disagree The with the above comments. described physical picture by Christiansen et al.' seems to be very similar to that suggested by us2,3, that

572