

## correspondence

### More on mountain-top clouds in Iran

F. Loewe, *Department of Meteorology,  
University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia*

The striking pictures of clouds on Mt. Demavend (BULLETIN, 50, No. 12, 1019) reminded me vividly of views of the mountain and its cloud formations I had whilst flying in Iran as long as 42 years ago. But beautiful as the mountain is: if its height is 18,375 ft, it is not as claimed "the highest peak of the Eurasian land mass west of the Himalaya range." Many peaks of the Hindukush and of the Pamirs are much higher. Even west of Demavend Mt. Elbruz in

the Caucasus is higher. It is also not correct that "outside the Himalaya complex chain and the Andes chain only Mt. Kilimanjaro and Mt. McKinley are higher." Demavend is also far exceeded by Mt. Logan in the Yukon Territory of Canada. If Mt. Logan is included in the Andes chain, the same would hold for Mt. McKinley too. It seems also very doubtful whether all ranges of Central Asia can be included in the "Himalaya complex chain." This applies particularly to Tien Shan and Bogdo Ola which have higher summits culminating at a height of 24,570 ft. These mountains are as far from the Himalaya as the Mississippi is from the Colorado Rockies.

## letter to the editor

### To the Editor:

As a member of the AMS, I urge the editors of the BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN METEOROLOGICAL SOCIETY to review their policy of publishing personal opinions, thoughts and observations under the "Articles" listing in the BULLETIN. As an example, I specifically cite W. P. Lowry's recent opinion before a legislative task force (Environmental Effects of Nuclear Cooling Facilities) appearing in the January 1970 issue. Certainly Lowry is entitled to his opinion as others might be allowed to refute him. I am not questioning this, but I do question the BULLETIN's use of the "Articles" section to accomplish it. Vague conclusions which are based on current or intended investigations which are not properly referenced, or personal knowledge not generally available to other investigators are just some of the dangers. These type articles soon gain scientific respectability because of a person's recognized contributions and are quickly accepted by non-specialists who subscribe to or read the BULLETIN.

Certainly, scientific curiosity and inquiry should not be impeded and the Executive Council of the Society is well aware of the issue concerning opinions (see page 40 of the January 1970 issue). However, it is time for new thinking by the editors and officials of the Society about the purpose of

the BULLETIN, otherwise in their haste to make opinions known, some which perhaps were once unfashionable but are now in style, wider ranging implications of an issue are lost. I would suggest several ways to deal with this policy of publishing opinions. First, the BULLETIN should continue to expand its publication of survey type articles of new and topical subjects by enlisting panels consisting of qualified investigators in the field regardless of their affiliation. Second, persons should be recruited who would be allowed to express their opinions in a forum type arrangement each month, such as is now done by the *Journal of the Air Pollution Control Association*. Third, interviews with distinguished members of the Society could also be published where they could express opinions on a wide ranging choice of topics. Occasionally the *Chemical and Engineering News* of the American Chemical Society has published such interviews.

As the BULLETIN is now structured, the Letters to the Editor section serves no useful purpose since the Society does not use the BULLETIN as a platform for editorial opinion. Inclusion of opinions in this section would only lead to extended semantics.

JOHN A. FRIZZOLA  
Port Jefferson, N. Y.