

Letter to the Editor

ON THE GALVANOMAGNETIC "PARADOX"

(Reply to Letter to Editor by T. S. Zhuravleva)

T. S. Zhuravleva's Letter [UFN 87, 582 (1965), transl. 8, 914 (1966)] concerning my article "A Hall-effect Problem" [UFN 82, 161 (1964), transl. 7, 49 (1964)] is the result of insufficiently attentive reading of my paper. In spite of T. S. Zhuravleva's opinion, it is nowhere stated in the paper that the action of the secondary Hall emf violates any law or is paradoxical. To the contrary, the whole article is devoted to proving the regular character of this phenomenon in all cases, and the word

"paradox" is printed in quotation marks throughout. Is it necessary to explain that the opposite is meant in such cases? In my opinion such comments are unnecessary.

I chose to name this experiment "galvanomagnetic 'paradox'" by analogy with other names of well-known demonstrations: the hydrostatic "paradox," "London" fog, etc.

V. Serkov