The Weekly Newsmagazine of Science

A Science Service Publication Volume 132, No. 21, November 21, 1987

E.G. Sherburne Jr.

Joel Greenberg Editor Senior Editor/ Physical Sciences Dietrick E. Thomsen Laurie Jackson Managing Editor Production/Design Wendy McCarren Director Bruce Bower Behavioral Sciences Richard Monastersky Earth Sciences Stefi Weisburd General Science Diane D. Edwards, Life Sciences/ Biomedicine Rick Weiss Janet Raloff, Ivars Peterson Policy/Technology Jonathan Eberhart Space Sciences Janice Rickerich Assistant to the Editor Science Writer Intern Steve Eisenberg

Publisher

Copyright © 1987 by Science Service, Inc., Editorial and Business Offices, 1719 N St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Republication of any portion of SCIENCE NEWS without written permission of the publisher is prohibited.

Books

Manager

Advertising/Business

Jane M. Livermore

Donald R. Harless

Subscription Department 231 West Center Street, Marion, Ohio 43305

Subscription rate: 1 yr., \$34.50; 2 yrs., \$58.00. (Foreign postage \$6.00 additional per year.) Change of address: Four to six weeks' notice is required. Please state exactly how magazine is to be addressed. Include zip code. For new subscriptions only call (1) 800-247-2160. Printed in I.S.A. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C., and additional mailing offices. Title registered as trademark U.S. and Canadian Patent Offices. Published every Saturday by SCIENCE SERVICE, Inc., 1719 N St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. (202-785-2255) ISSN 0036-8423

This Week

324	Neurons Regenerate Into Spinal Cord
324	Reactions to alcohol: Cortisol clues
325	After the battle, tPA declared a winner
325	Solar cells that work in the dark
326	Rising sea levels: Predictions and plans
326	Ring around a gravitational lens
326	Quakes hit Pacific coast
327	Signs of a 'something' circling a star
327	Better animal models for genetic defects

Research Notes

334	Anthropology
334	Chemistry
335	Computers
335	Earth Sciences

Articles

330 Spacebound Again: The Making of the Fleet

Cover: On the morning of April 21, 1981, NASA's space shuttle program was launched with the successful liftoff of Columbia (shown here). Grounded since Challenger exploded on Jan. 28, 1986, the shuttle is scheduled to resume flights next year — barring technical setbacks. Rounding out the 1988 schedule are seven launches of unmanned "expendable launched vehicles." (Photo: Adapted from NASA)

332 Astronomy in West Germany Goes Supernational



Departments

322 **Books** 323 Letters

Science Service Institution for the public understanding of science founded 1921; a nonprofit corporation. Board of Trustees — President, Glenn T. Seaborg; Vice President, Gerald F. Tape; Treasurer, Willis Harlow Shapley; Secretary, Hilleary F. Hoskinson; Joseph W. Berg Jr.; Edward Bliss Jr.; Bowen C. Dees; David A. Goslin; J. David Hann; Milton Harris; Elena O. Nightingale; O.W. Riegel; H. Guyford Stever; John Troan;

Director: E. G. Sherburne Jr.; Assistant Director: Dorothy Schriver; Business Manager: Donald R. Harless.

Letters

Taken to tusk

I read with interest "Prehistoric tusk: Early boomerang?" (SN: 10/3/87, p.215), as making and throwing boomerangs has been my hobby for years. My bet is that this tusk is a very big, nonreturning kyrie, or "killing stick."

Australians used to have contests to see just how big a returning stick they could build. Five feet seems to be the limit, with use of special airfoils and modern plywood. I myself own a 3-foot returning boomerang. However, rarely do boomerangs longer than 18 to 20 inches return well. And 0.6 inch thick! Few modern returning boomerangs exceed a thickness of 0.25 inch, and long-distance returning boomerangs are rarely thicker than

The angle between the leading and trailing arms also influences the returning ability of the stick. This angle must be greater than 70°

and less than 120°. Although I don't know beans about the density of mammoth tusk, I'll bet it's similar to bones in current mammals. This stick must weigh 3 pounds or more. I don't believe a returning boomerang greater than about 24 ounces can be built (my 3-foot boomerang weighs 13 ounces).

Increased wing thickness (1) increases weight, which is detrimental to good return flights; and (2) increases air resistance to the airfoil on both the leading and trailing wings, which decreases lift and is also detrimental to good return flights. The dimensions of this tusk seem much more appropriate for a nonreturner, where increased mass (up to a point, anyway) is desirable.

Fredric A. Malmberg York, Pa.

I would guess that the Polish find of a mammoth tusk might be a real boomerang, for primitive people were intelligent enough -

if only out of necessity - to hit upon such an invention.

The aborigines of Australia had the natural advantage of a tree called the mulga, which grows its branches in right-angle zigzags or very sharp curves that make it possible to split out a thin section blade with one flat side the outside. Their boomerang was thrown overhand with a quick snap that set it whirling so that whichever way it struck it was effective. It was thrown straight and was never intended to return to the thrower, and I suspect that the return stuff was a white man's invention - a toy for the kids. The curved side over the flat side gives it lift, and a wind can turn it around in flight.

How a Polish strong man was able to split the end of a mammoth's tusk is another matter, but that curved end of an old mammoth's tusk would be just the thing for a boomerang.

> Allan O Kelly Carlsbad, Calif.

NOVEMBER 21, 1987 323