



80 years ago – the Discovery of the Raman Effect at the Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science, Kolkata, India*

Rajinder Singh

University of Oldenburg, Faculty V – Institute of Physics,
Research Group · Physik Education, History and Philosophy of Science, PO Box 2503, 26111 Oldenburg,
Germany

E-mail · Rajinder.singh@mail.uni-oldenburg.de

Abstract : In February 1928, Chandrasekhar Venkata Raman (1888-1970) and his student K S Krishnan (1892-1962) discovered an effect (later to be named as the Raman effect) at the Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science, Kolkatta. Nearly at the same time the effect was also observed by the Russian physicists Grigori Samuilovich Landsberg (1890-1957) and Leonid Isaakovich Mandelstam (1879-1944) In the beginning the reception of the discovery in Germany was rather cold. In 1930 the Physics Nobel Prize was awarded to C V Raman alone. Why Krishnan and the Russian physicists were ignored by the Nobel Committee? The question has been answered with the documents (nominations letters and the reports) that were obtained from the Nobel Committee. Based on Krishnan's diary, his role in the discovery has been analysed. Evidences are given for the fact that the use of Mercury vapour lamp by Raman was a well thought step, and not per chance as stated by one of Raman's students.

Keywords : C V Raman, K S Krishnan, G S Landsberg, L I Mandelstam, Raman effect, Raman spectroscopy, Nobel Prize

Plan of the article

1. Introduction

2. The Discovery of the Raman effect at the Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science, Kolkata, India

2.1. Research facilities for Raman

2.1.1. Raman's fields of interest

2.2. From light scattering to the discovery of the Raman effect

2.2.1. Mercury vapour lamp—Per chance or a well thought step?

2.3. The discovery of the Raman effect and Krishnan's contribution

3. Reception of the discovery of the Western scientific community

4. Honours by the scientific community – Raman vs. Krishnan

4.1. Krishnan and the Nobel prize

4.2. Russian physicists vs. Raman – Role of the Indian Journal of Physics

4.2.1. The Nobel prize proposals for C V Raman in 1929 and 1930

5. Conclusions

1. Introduction

In India, 28th February is being celebrated as National Science Day. It is in remembrance of the Raman effect, which was discovered by C V Raman and his students at the Indian Association for Cultivation of Science (IACS). About 70 years later, the American Chemical Society and the Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science designated the discovery of the Raman Effect as an International Historic Chemical Landmark in Kolkata (<http://preview.interlockingmedia.com/acslandmarks/landmarks/raman/raman.html>, dated June 4, 2008). Shortly after the discovery Raman was knighted and nominated for the Nobel Prize for Physics. In 1930, he was awarded the prize. Until the day, he remains the only Indian Nobel Laureate in the field of natural sciences. Not surprisingly a number of articles and books had been written on Raman [1]. However, none of the biographies and articles explains why the Nobel Committee gave its prize adjudication in favour of Raman, while K S Krishnan and Russian physicists G S Landsberg and Leonid I Mandelstam were ignored. In order to explain, why the Committee did so, a brief analysis of the Report of the Nobel Committee is given.

To start with we shall see which research facilities had Raman at the IACS, and what was Krishnan's role in the discovery of the Raman effect.

2. The discovery of the Raman effect at the Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science, Kolkata, India

2.1. Research facilities for Raman :

The well known facts are that Raman started research in the field of acoustics. His working place was the IACS. Being a bank employee he did research in spare time. Due to his scientific researches, Raman soon became a popular person among the Kolkata's educated elite. Asutosh Mookerjee – a jurist and an educationist, was the person known to offer Raman the Palit professorship. The less known fact is that

Raman was not the first choice. On June 29, 1912, Mookerjee wrote to the Viceroy of India that, “*I am hoping to be able to secure Dr. J C Bose for the Chair of Physics ...*”. Somehow this plan could not be realised and the chance was given to Raman.

In 1917, Raman was a *Palit Professor of Physics* at the University of Kolkata, but he was allowed to use the laboratories of Association as well as those of the University. In 1919, Raman became the Secretary of the Association. With increasing research activities in the Association, it was felt to create a plate form to discuss and publish the results. In 1917, in order to publish the presented results, the *Proceedings of the IACS* began [2]. After the *Indian Journal of Physics* came into existence, the *Proceedings* were incorporated in it (Figure 1).

Indian Journal of Physics

Vol. I.

AND
PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science

Vol. X.

Conducted by

Prof. C. V. RAMAN, M.A., D.Sc. (Hon.), F.R.S.

With eighteen plates.

Printed at the Calcutta University Press, Senate House, Calcutta, by
Bhupendralal Banerjee and published by Prof. C. V. Raman
for the Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science,
210, Bow-Bazar Street, Calcutta.

1926—1927

Price 12 Rupees or 16 Shillings or 4 Dollars.

Figure 1. Facsimile of the title page of the first issue of the Indian Journal of Physics (Courtesy Indian Journal of Physics, IACS).

The first Volume of the *Journal* also contains one of Raman's rare photographs with the American Nobel Laureate Robert Millikan (see Figure 2).



Figure 2. Group at Norman Bridge Laboratory of Physics, Pasadena, California. C V Raman with his host Robert A Millikan (right to Raman). In 1924, Raman was invited as Visiting Professor (Courtesy : *Indian Journal of Physics*, IACS).

Scientists at the IACS were not working in isolation. They were well informed about the research going on in the world. The library of the Association was subscribing ca. 100 journals and proceedings [3].

Raman had a number of research scholars. According to the *Annual Report of the IACS*, p435 (1928) (published in *Indian J. Phys.* 4 405 (1929-1930)) in year 1928 at the laboratory of the Association 32 research workers got research facilities. Out of them 21 worked for whole-time.

2.1.1. Raman's fields of interest :

Raman is known for his research in the fields of acoustics and optics. A less known fact is that he tried his hand in astronomy. The Astronomical Society of India (abbreviated as ASI) was founded in 1910 in connection with the observation of Halley's Comet [4]. In 1911, Raman was elected as a member of the ASI [5]. In the ASI, Raman had the chance to meet some British scientists such as W J Simmons – President of the Astronomical Society, Sir Sidney G Burrard, FRS (1860-1943), John

Evershed, FRS (1864-1956) – Vice-Presidents of the Society as well as the Director of the Kodaikanal Observatory in India, and Sir Gilbert T Walker, FRS (1868-1958), the Director-General of Observatories. Some of these well-known persons later nominated Raman for the Fellowship of the Royal Society. Raman delivered lectures that were published in the journal of the Society. Raman observed the lunar eclipse, Venus and the satellites of Jupiter with a small telescope. However, due to financial reasons he did not persuade with this field [6]. In the following years he concentrated on the light scattering in different media.

2.2. From light scattering to the discovery of the Raman effect :

Due to Lord Rayleigh's research, it was established that the blue colour of the sea has nothing to do with the colour of water, but is simply the blue of the sky as seen by reflection [7]. In the beginning of 1920s Raman disproved Rayleigh's idea, showing that the blue colour of the sea is caused by the diffraction of light by water molecules [8]. For this they made use of the Einstein-Smoluchowski formula and found that the scattering power of a medium, in this case sea water, also varies inversely with the fourth power of the wavelength, thus giving the sea its blue colour. Raman's concern with the nature of light also led him to study experimentally how light is scattered in liquids and crystals and to determine its dependence on the frequency of the light [9]. He further studied the scattering of light in dense vapours and gases, finding that it was not completely polarized as was predicted by theory [10]. Raman focused on the orientation of the molecules in liquids, developing a qualitative theory that in some cases was able to account for the observed polarization [11,12]. One of Raman's collaborators, K R Ramanathan (1893-1985), also carried out experiments and studied the intensity of light scattered by liquids and observed that it was in agreement with theory for moderately anisotropic molecules, while it diverged from theory for strongly anisotropic molecules [13]. These results led him to examine how the polarization of the scattered light depended on its wavelength, leading him to remark : *"Incidentally it is shown that a change previously observed in the imperfection of polarisation with water and alcohol is due to the presence of a trace of fluorescence"* [14].

So far the theoretical physics is concerned, in 1922 the English theoretical physicist Charles G Darwin (1887-1962) attempted to explain dispersion, unsuccessfully, on the basis of quantum theory [15]. The following year the Austrian physicist Adolf Smekal (1895-1959) assumed that light has a quantum structure and showed that scattered monochromatic light would consist of its original wavelength as well as of higher and lower wavelengths [16]. Nevertheless, none of this theoretical work, and in particular Smekal's prediction of the appearance of higher and lower wavelengths when monochromatic light is scattered, exerted a direct influence on the discovery of the Raman effect.

Evidence for such an effect was published in July 1928 by the Russian physicists G S Landsberg and L I Mandelstam [17–19] who were studying Albert Einstein's and Peter Debye's theories of the specific heats of solids. In India, Raman and Krishnan made their discovery while searching for an optical analogue of the Compton effect. Raman noted in his first report that in 1922 he and his student K S Rao had observed the depolarization of water as a function of wavelength. Three years later, Krishnan observed, as K R Ramanathan had before him, a "feeble fluorescence" when light was scattered by various liquids. Attempts to determine the spectrum of this "feeble fluorescence" during the following years failed, because its intensity was too low [20]. Raman first displayed spectra showing a change of frequency during a lecture he gave at a meeting of the South Indian Scientists Association on March 16, 1928 (Figure 3) [21]. In all, he and Krishnan had observed scattered secondary radiation of smaller frequency in 60 liquids and vapours [22]. Because the scattered light was of relatively high intensity and was polarized, they could rule out the possibility that it was fluorescent radiation.




Figure 3. Top : Polarisation of scattered light in toluene – 1. Unmodified, 2. Modified. Middle-upper : Mercury arc light filtered through a blue glass with transmission range from 350 to 440 Nano-meter. Middle-lower : Scattered spectrum of benzene with additional lines. Bottom-upper : Mercury arc incident light filtered with potassium permanganate solution. Bottom-lower : Scattered spectrum (Courtesy *Indian Journal of Physics, IACS*).

Prior to the above lecture, Raman sent two short articles to *Nature* (one written jointly with Krishnan) [23], which he signed on February 16 and March 8, 1928, respectively, and which appeared in print before the first publication of the Russian physicists, which was communicated to *Die Naturwissenschaften* on May 6, 1928, and appeared in July 1928 [24].

2.2.1. Mercury vapour lamp – Per chance or a well thought step?

In the second communication to *Nature*, Raman informed the readers that Indian authors replaced the sun by a mercury arc as source of light. They were encouraged to use mercury arc as source of light after they observed that there is a dark region between the modified and unmodified region.

Twenty five years later, that is, at the Silver Jubilee of the Raman effect one of Raman's earliest associates K R Ramanathan stated that Raman used the mercury arc by accident, as it was a rainy day. The author Jayaraman states that Raman asked Ramanathan to fly from Bombay to Bangalore and give him explanation for the statement. After a long talk with Raman, "*Ramanathan issued a statement to the Press retracting what he had said and profusely apologised for the mistake he had made*" [25].

Why Ramanathan gave statement against Raman, which he later retracted. Perhaps the former was correct and due to pressure from Raman changed his views? In order to find evidences for the "rainy day" I decided to check weather condition in Kolkata between 26-28th February 1928. In this connection the present author wrote a letter to the Director-General of Meteorology, Kolkata. The meteorological data regarding the sun-shine supplied to me by Regional Meteorological Centre – Alipore Station, Kolkata shows that on all these days there was clear sky and no rain fall (Private communication, T K Chakraborty – for the DDGM, letter dated Nov. 17, 1999). Evidently, Raman knew what he was doing and the use of mercury arc was not an accident.

2.3. The discovery of the Raman effect and Krishnan's contribution :

In the beginning of 1928 due to Raman's initiative Krishnan (one of the 21 full-time researchers) restarted his experimental work (see below). Until the discovery, he had 17 publications [26]. The major work done by him was the study of the intensity and the polarisation of scattered light in 65 liquids [27].

In general, a guide has own ideas and schemes and direct the group according to his needs. The story was not different in 1920s. According to Raman's lecture at the Faraday's Society (published in the *Trans. Faraday Society* 25 781 (1929)) various considerations, such as the derivation of Compton's law with the help of the wave theory, he came to a conclusion on the existence of an effect with change in wavelengths in visible light, similar to that one observed in the X-rays. Evidently the

idea of the discovery was due to Raman. Also the entry in Krishnan's diary leaves no doubt about it. For instance, on February 5, 1928 Krishnan noted that :

For a long time past I haven't done any systematic experimental work;.... It was mainly with a view to start immediately some experimental work that I took up **(at the suggestion of Professor)** the general problem of the fluorescence of organic vapours; rather than from the pressing nature of any specific problem in the subject awaiting experimental solution, which usually draw a man to a new field. ... (emphasis added) [28].

And further :

Professor has been working with me all the time. However in view of the fact that fluorescence of anthracene vapour does not show any polarisation **Professor asked me** to verify again his [Venkateswaran] observations on the polarisation in some of the liquids (emphasis added).

On February 7, 1928, Krishnan wrote :

When I told Professor about the results he wouldn't believe that all liquids can show polarised fluorescence and that in the visible region (underlined in original). He wondered how we missed discovering all that five years ago.

It is evident from above that Krishnan did manual work. Raman wondered about the results. Krishnan remained "cool". Obviously, Krishnan was not aware of the importance of the discovery. He even did not think to find out the explanation of the observation, while Raman did, as on the same day Krishnan noted in his diary :

After meals at night Venkateswaran and myself were chatting together in our room when Prof[essor] suddenly came to the house (at about 9 pm) and called for me. When we went down we found he was very much excited and had come to tell me that what we had observed this morning **must be Kramers-Heisenberg effect we had been looking for all these days**. We were talking in front of our house for more than a quarter of an hour when **he repeatedly emphasised the exciting nature of the discovery** (emphasis added).

It was Raman who tried to correlate the experimental observations with Kramers-Heisenberg theory. Again, not Krishnan but Raman "*repeatedly emphasised the exciting nature of the discovery*".

Krishnan's diary also tells us that Raman wanted to call the phenomenon as "the Raman-Krishnan-effect". Evidently, Raman was interested to use this term. However, the scientific community outside of India saw it differently. The term Raman effect was first used by the French physicists in April 1928 [29].

In the following days, that between February 10-16th routine work is reported by Krishnan. On the last day, a short article "*A new type of secondary radiation*" was sent to *Nature* [30].

On February 17, 1928 Krishnan noted : “*Professor confirmed the polarisation of fluorescence in pentane vapour. I am having some trouble with my eye. Professor promised to make all observations himself for some time to come*” (emphasis added).

After that, a short entry appears as follows : 19-26 February 1928, “*Studied a number of other vapours*”, and “*Monday 27 February, 1928, Stepmother’s ceremony. Didn’t go to the Association*”.

We find a long entry in the diary on February 28, 1928. In part it reads : “*Went to the Association only in the afternoon. Prof(essor) was there and we proceeded to examine the influence of the wavelength of the incident light on the phenomenon*”.

From the above discussion we see that due to private reasons, Krishnan was unable to work on 27th February and half of day on 28th of February. On the 28th of February, Raman was absolutely sure about the discovery. On that day he informed the local newspaper. *The Statesman*, on February 29, 1928 wrote a short article “*New Theory of Radiation – Prof. Raman’s Discovery*”.

The second paper sent on March 8, 1928 to *Nature*, was signed by Raman alone. He started the paper as follows: “*Further observations by Mr. Krishnan and myself on the new kind of light scattering discovered by us have been made and have led to surprising and interesting results*” (emphasis added) [31].

The first communication in *Nature* indicates that in the middle of February, Raman and Krishnan started taking the spectrum. In his March 16, 1928 lecture, Raman presented the line spectra of benzene (Figure 3), but without giving quantitative explanation. Such results appeared about two months later [32]. The published lecture also informed that in between, the effect was studied not only in 80 liquids, but also in the case of gases (carbon dioxide – CO_2 and nitrous oxide – N_2O), ice and amorphous solids. Thus, the universality of the effect was established.

3. Reception of the discovery of the Western scientific community

The first person to take note of Raman’s discovery was the French scientist Yves Rocard (1903-1992), who published a paper on it in the April 23, 1928, issue of the *Comptes rendus* of the *Académie des Sciences* [33]. In Germany, it seems that Raman’s discovery was known only through Raman’s short articles in *Nature*. The German theoretical physicist Georg Joos (1894-1959) wrote from Jena to Arnold Sommerfeld (Figure 4) in Munich on May 14, 1928, asking, “*Do you think that Raman’s work on the optical Compton effect in liquids is reliable? ... The sharpness of the scattered lines in liquids seems doubtful to me*” (translated from German). Although Raman’s experiments could not be repeated successfully in Munich, Sommerfeld nevertheless replied to Joos on June 9, 1928, that : “*In my opinion Raman is correct.... He writes to me, that the difference between the lines is exactly*



Figure 4. Due to an invitation from M N Saha and C V Raman in 1928 the German physicist Arnold Sommerfeld – University of Munich visited India Raman and Krishnan with their guest at the IACS (Courtesy Raman Research Institute, Bangalore)

equal to the infrared frequencies of the molecules under consideration" (translated from German).

In Berlin, Peter Pringsheim (1881-1963) repeated Raman's experiments successfully and sent his spectra to Sommerfeld on June 20, 1928, thus vindicating Sommerfeld's belief in the validity of Raman's work. Pringsheim then reported his work in two articles the following month [34,35] becoming the first person in German speaking area to coin the terms "Raman effect" and "Raman lines". In 1929 Clemens Schäfer and Frank Matossi contributed an article on "*Der Ramaneffekt*" to the *Fortschritte der Chemie, Physik und Physikalische Chemie* [36], here emphasizing its importance for chemistry. In 1931, K W F Kohlrausch published a book that contained 417 references on what he called the Smekal-Raman effect [37].

Raman received the Nobel Prize only two years after he made the discovery (details below).

4. Honours by the scientific community – Raman vs. Krishnan

In 1924, Raman was elected as a Fellow of the Royal Society of London. After the discovery many honours were poured on Raman. According to the *Report of the IACS 1929* (published in *Indian Journal of Physics*, Vol. 5, 1939, pp. 309-335) page 311

In recognition of the importance of his discovery, the Honorary Secretary of the Association has been recipient of numerous honours during the year under report. The Italian Society of Science, Rome, conferred upon him the Matteucci Gold Medal which is awarded for “the most important physical discovery of the year”. This was followed by the honour of the conferment of knighthood by the British Government. The Faraday Society of London organized a well-attended discussion on “Molecular Spectra and Molecular Structure” at Bristol in September, 1929, at which several papers on the Raman effect and related topics were presented. Sir C V Raman was invited to open the discussion of the subject at Bristol. Invitations to lecture were received by him from numerous quarters, amongst others from the following which were accepted, namely the Universities of London, Cambridge and Edinburgh in Great Britain, the Universities of Paris, Aachen and Freiburg on the Continent, and the Physical Societies of England, France; Belgium and Switzerland. The University of Freiburg gave him the honorary degree of “Doctor Philosophiae Naturalis” and he received the Honorary membership of the Physical Society on the occasion of his visit to Zurich”.

The above paragraph leaves no doubt Raman’s status among the scientific community in India and abroad. Even before the discovery, since 1907, his work was being mentioned in the *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik* a mouth-piece of the German Physical Society [38]. One of Raman’s nominators, R Pfeiffer (from Breslau), saw it as worthwhile to mention this part of Raman’s work in his nomination letter of January 22nd, 1930.

Let us see, which status Krishnan had at the time of the discovery. He was one of many researchers working under Raman. In terms of his publications as the bibliography of Krishnan’s papers shows that in 1925, he published his first paper on “*The molecular scattering of light in liquids*” [39]. Before the discovery paper in *Nature* [40], Krishnan published 17 communications, and out of them only in four cases he was a sole author [41]. Out of these four papers, only one was published abroad, i.e. in *Philosophical Magazine* [42]. Out of 13 publications with Raman, only in one case, Krishnan was the first author [43]. This evidently shows that Krishnan’s status at this stage was not more than a brilliant research scholar working under Raman. Krishnan became an independent scholar after he left Kolkata. In independent India he became the first Director of the National Physical Laboratory, Delhi. His influence on Indian physics has been well documented in *Current Science*, Vol. 75 (11) on pages 1197-1275 in the special section entitled “K S Krishnan Birth Centenary”.

4.1. Krishnan and the Nobel prize :

The history of India’s Nobel Prize nominators and nominees clearly shows that Krishnan never achieved the status of M N Saha (nominated 4 times) and H J Bhabha who were nominated for the Nobel Prize [44].

In the first paper related to the discovery, Krishnan was a co-author [45]. In the second paper on “*A change of wavelength in light scattering*”, Raman was the sole author [46]. For the time being omission of Krishnan's name as second author remains unexplained. However, the fact is that in the text Raman stressed that Krishnan worked with him. He put Krishnan's name on the first place. Within the entire paper Raman used the word “we” and not “I”. Clearly, Raman did not minimize Krishnan's contribution. Even 7 years later, while nominating Krishnan for the Fellowship of the Royal Society of London, Raman admitted in Krishnan's nomination letter (see page 1270, *Current Science* 75 (11), 1998) that Krishnan was the co-discoverer.

So far the Nobel Prize is concerned, the names of Raman's collaborators (in particular Krishnan's) were known to the Committee as well as to the expert who prepared the reports. The documents such as the reports of the Nobel Committee as well nomination letters show that not a single collaborator of Raman was nominated by the competent people. Even if the Nobel Committee would have liked to consider Krishnan, it had no chance as according to Danish historians “*no one can receive the prize in a given year without being nominated for that year*” [47].

The Russian physicists were nominated for the year 1930. They had the chance to get the Nobel Prize. Why the Committee ignored them? The detail is given below.

4.2. Russian physicists vs. Raman – Role of the Indian Journal of Physics :

In the case of Raman's discovery and the Nobel Prize *Indian Journal of Physics* played a prominent role. Though the two papers related to discovery were sent to *Nature* earlier, however, the first publication detailed report on the discovery with spectrographic evidences was printed in the *Indian Journal of Physics*. Thanks due to the workers in Kolkata, thousands of reprints of the paper was published. “*They were posted the same day to scientists all over the world*” [48]. One of the reprints of the “discovery paper” that is “*A new radiation*” is to be found in the Niels Bohr Archive, Copenhagen.

Not only that the “Bibliography of 150 papers on the Raman effect” (it contains 160 entries) was also published in the Journal. In it papers are listed chronologically according to the date of publication [49]. In it, “*A new radiation*” [50] took first place. The Nobel Committee also considered this paper as the first publication. For instance according to the Report : “*Raman's first observation (Indian J. Phys. 2 387 (1928))*” (emphasis added). In the bibliography, it had been shown by the author that before the first paper of the Russians was to appear in the French journal *Comptes Rendus*, on July 9, 1928, 15 papers had already been published. Most of them belonged to Indian and French scientists. In the bibliography it is also shown that Landsberg and Mandelstam quoted Indian's papers [51].

Like the discovery article, Raman sent the reprints of the bibliography to the well-known scientists. For example, Ernest Rutherford (1871-1937) and C T R Wilson (1869-1959) in their nomination letter of January 25th, 1930 regretted for not preparing

Raman's list of publications, but sent the list of many publications on the Raman effect, which was prepared by one of his students.

In 1929 Raman effect had become a reality. The study of *Science Abstracts, Section A – Physics* shows that in 1929, the terms Raman diffusion or the Raman effect at least 38 times was mentioned. And in the following year the term Raman-spectra, Raman effect etc. were used 85 times [52]. Obviously, the scientific community accepted Raman as the discoverer.

4.2.1. The Nobel prize proposals for C V Raman in 1929 and 1930 :

For the Nobel Prize in year 1929, C Fabry (France) had recommended J Cabannes and C V Raman, where as N Bohr proposed that either R W Wood or R W Wood and Raman should get the Nobel prize for physics (Table 1). In the same year, 48 nominators sent 97 proposals and proposed 29 people [53], but none of them nominated the Russian scientists.

Table 1. Nominations in favour of C V Raman in the years 1929 and 1930. The data based on the nomination letters and the *Reports of Nobel Committee* [54,55].

NP for the Year	Nominator(s)	Nominee(s)
1929	C Fabry	J Cabanes and C V Raman
	N Bohr	R W Wood or Wood and Raman
1930	F L de Broglie, H M de Broglie, R Pfeiffer, J Stark, E Rutherford and C T R Wilson	C V Raman alone
	O Chwolson	Half for Raman and the second half for Landsberg and Mandelstam
	E Bloch	Wood and C V Raman
	J Perrin	Raman or Raman and W Heisenberg
	N Bohr	Wood or Wood and Raman

According to the “Document Number 711”, that is, the *Report of the Nobel Committee* (dated Sept. 30, 1930), page 1 : “For the year 1930, 39 competent people were asked to make proposals. Out of them, 37 people sent proposals. There were 21 valid recommendations for a full or shared prize (Translated from Swedish)”. Raman was nominated ten times (Table 1). As far as the Russian nominators were concerned, N Papalexis of Leningrad on January 6, 1930 proposed that the prize should go to Mandelstam alone, whereas O Chwolson on the same day stated that Raman should get half of it and the rest should go to Landsberg and Mandelstam.

Russian's second nominator, N Papalexis, after telling the importance of combination scattering for radiation theory, stated that the discovery deserves the Nobel

prize, and prize should be awarded to Leonid Mandelstam who did experimental and theoretical work on light scattering. Thus in his letter, Papalexis claims that by 1918, Mandelstam had already come to the idea about the existence of the scattered light with changed frequencies, but he first published his results in 1926 in a Russian Journal.

According to the rules of the Nobel Prizes, an expert has to write a report on the work of the nominee. The expert who gave the report on Raman's work was Erik Hulthen, a spectroscopist who was Professor and the Director of the Physical Institute as well as a member of the Nobel Committee. On May 26, 1930 he sent document : *Kompletterande Utredning roeande Raman-effekten (The complete explanation of the Raman-effect)*. The report is in favour of Raman and cites work done by different scientists on the topic in the past years. In the conclusion of the report at page 8 he stated that the Russian scientists did not come to an independent interpretation of the discovery as they cited Raman's work.

Contrary to the Russian nominators, the Nobel Committee was of the opinion that Smekal in 1923, and Kramers and Heisenberg in 1925, had already given the theoretical explanation (*Report Nobel Committee*, p.12). Thus the claim of the Russians for the predication of the effect on the basis of theory was rejected. As far as the experimental discovery was concerned, the Committee had the same opinion as its expert. Another point that favoured Raman, was that the Committee believed that the universality of the phenomenon was established by Raman, who carried out observations in ca. 80 substances (*Report Nobel Committee*, p. 6). On September 20, 1930 the Nobel Committee submitted its report to the Swedish Academy of Sciences. According to the Report : "*The Committee has decided to ask the Academy to award the Nobel prize for physics for the year 1930 to Sir Chandrasekhara Venkata Raman, for his work on the scattering of light and the discovery of the effect named after him*" (*Report Nobel Committee*, p.20). The Swedish Academy of Sciences, which is empowered to take final decision also gave its decision in favour of Raman.

Raman became the first Indian Nobel Laureate in the field of Natural Sciences. According to the rules of nomination, he had the right to nominate others. Until the middle of 20th Century he nominated thrice. None of his candidates were Indians. Details of Raman and other Indian nominators and nominees in the fields of physics and chemistry are explored in a separate article [56].

5. Conclusions

(i) Raman was not a "poor" scientist. He had good research facilities. He was well informed about the on going research in all major fields as the Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science had most of the renowned journals.

(ii) The use of Mercury vapour lamp by Raman was not due to rainy weather. It was a well thought out step.

(iii) In the discovery of the effect most of the manual work was done by Raman's students, who followed the instructions. Krishnan was one of them. No doubt Krishnan played important role, but the ideas and the interpretation of the discovery were due to the teacher Raman.

(iv) Raman's case shows that the establishment of a scientist among the scientific community plays a role so far the international honours are concerned. Before the discovery Raman was an established physicist within India and abroad. Not surprisingly he was nominated by renowned physicists. In the end of 1920s Krishnan (who later shaped the scientific policies of India) was in the beginning of his career. At that stage neither the Indian nominators, D M Bose and S K Mitra, (not discussed in this paper) nor the Western ones were of the opinion that the discovery was due to him.

(v) We also see the importance of having its own scientific journals for a country. Raman used *Indian Journal of Physics* for quick publication and to combat for the priority of the discovery as well as making publicity of his work. It played important role in the nomination for and award of the Nobel Prize.

(vi) The Nobel Committee was of the opinion that the Russian scientists were not supposed to have obtained their experimental results independently, mainly because they cited from Raman's papers in their publications. Apart from that the Committee was of the opinion that Raman established the universal character of the effect by investigating a large number of solids and liquids.

Acknowledgments

I acknowledge the great help given by Mrs. Adelheid Wegner Demmer, ICBM, University of Oldenburg (Germany), for the Swedish translation. I thank Dr. Jan Tapdrup for translation of a N Bohr letter from Danish to English. I am grateful to the Nobel Archive of the Royal Swedish Academy of Science, Stockholm (Sweden) for sending the documents (nomination letters and reports) concerning the Nobel Prize. Thanks are due to Niels Bohr Archive, Copenhagen (Denmark) for sending the correspondence of N Bohr and C V Raman; Deutsche Museum Archive (Germany) for A Sommerfeld Correspondence; Archive – Churchill College, Cambridge (UK) for A Mookerjee letter. Thanks are due to the editor of *Indian Journal of Physics* and Director of the IACS (Kolkata) for permitting to reproduce photographs for this paper; Librarian IACS for providing the Reports of the Association. The Photograph (Figure 2) reproduced here was obtained from the RRI (Bangalore). I am thankful to the Director for permitting me to reproduce the same. I am grateful to Prof. Falk Riess, Research Group – Physics Education, History and Philosophy of Science, University of Oldenburg (Germany) for providing research facilities.

Thanks are due to Prof. D Mukherjee – Director, IACS for encouraging me to send this paper to the *Indian Journal of Physics*. I am thankful to the learned referee for

his valued comments on this paper. I greatly appreciate Prof. S P Bhattachryya, Editor-in-Chief and Mr. A N Ghatak Staff Editor (Technical officer-II) of IJP for their valued support and co-operation in bringing out this paper. Last but not the least, I thank the Editors and Staff Members of IJP for extending their co-operation.

References

- [1] P Krishnamurti *Sir C V Raman : A Short Biographical Sketch* (Bangalore : The Bangalore Press) (1938), G H Keswani *Raman and His Effect* (New Delhi : National Book Trust India) (1980); P R Pisharoty *C V Raman* (New Delhi : Publications Division) (1982); S N Sen *Prof. C V Raman : Scientific Work at Kolkata* (Kolkata : Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science) (1988); G Venkataraman *Journey Into Light Life and Science of C V Raman* (New Delhi : Indian Academy of Sciences) (1988); A Jayaraman *C V Raman . A Memoir* (New Delhi : Affiliated East-West Private Ltd) (1989); G Venkataraman *Raman and His Effect* (Hyderabad . University Press (India) Ltd) (1995)
- [2] IACS *A Century* (Kolkata : Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science) p31 (1976)
- [3] R Singh *Nobel Laureate C V Raman's Work on Light Scattering – Historical Contributions to a Scientific Biography* (Berlin : Logos Verlag) p15 (2004)
- [4] Editor, *Journal of the Astronomical Society of India* (abbreviated as *JASI*) 1 1 (1910-1911)
- [5] Editor, *JASI* 2 144 (1911-1912)
- [6] see Ref. [3], R Singh *Nobel Laureate C V Raman's Work on Light Scattering* p24 (2004)
- [7] L Rayleigh *Nature* 83 48 (1910)
- [8] C V Raman *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.* A101 64 (1922)
- [9] C V Raman *Nature* 109 75 (1922).
- [10] C V Raman and K R Ramanathan *Phil. Mag* 45 113 (1923)
- [11] C V Raman *Nature* 110 11 (1922)
- [12] C V Raman and K S Rao *Phil Mag.* 45 625 (1923)
- [13] K R Ramanathan *Proc. IACS* 8 1 (1922-1923)
- [14] K R Ramanathan *Proc. IACS* . 8 181 (1922-1923)
- [15] C G Darwin *Nature* 110 841 (1922)
- [16] A Smekal *Naturw* 43 873 (1923)
- [17] G S Landsberg and L I Mandelstam *Naturw.* 16 557 (1928)
- [18] G S Landsberg and L I Mandelstam *Zeit. f. Phys.* 50 769 (1928)
- [19] G S Landsberg and L I Mandelstam *Comptes rendus* 186 109 (1928)
- [20] C V Raman *Indian J. Phys.* 2 388 (1927-1928)
- [21] *ibid*
- [22] C V Raman and K S Krishnan *Nature* 121 501 (1928)
- [23] C V Raman *Nature* 121 619 (1928)
- [24] see Ref. [17]
- [25] see Ref. [1], A Jayaraman, *Chandrasekhara Venkata Raman – A memoir* 107 (1992)
- [26] K Lal (ed.) *Collected Works of K S Krishnan* (New Delhi : National Physical Laboratory) *Contents* (1988)
- [27] KS Krishnan *Phil. Mag.* 50 697 (1925)
- [28] D C V Mallik *Notes Rec. R. Soc. Lond.* 54 67 (2000)
- [29] A S Ganesan *Indian J. Phys.* 4 281 (1929)
- [30] see Ref. [22]

- [31] see Ref. [23]
- [32] C V Raman and K S Krishnan *Indian J. Phys.* **2** 399 (1927-1928)
- [33] Y Rocard *Comptes rendus* **186** 1107 (1928)
- [34] P Pringsheim *Naturw.* **31** 597 (1928)
- [35] P Pringsheim and B Rosen *Zeit. f. Phys.* **50** 741 (1928)
- [36] A Eucken (ed.) *Fortschritte der Chemie, Physik und Physikalische Chemie* (Berlin : Verlag von Gebrüder Borbtreger) pp1-52 (1929)
- [37] K W F Kohlrausch *Der Smekal-Raman-Effekt* (Berlin : Springer Verlag) (1931)
- [38] see Ref. 3, R Singh, *Nobel Laureate C V Raman's Work on Light Scattering* p233 (2004)
- [39] K S Krishnan *Phil. Mag.* **50** 697 (1925)
- [40] see Ref. [22]
- [41] see Ref. [26], K Lal (ed.) *Content* (1988)
- [42] K S Krishnan *Phil. Mag.* **50** 697 (1925)
- [43] K S Krishnan and C V Raman *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.* **115** 549 (1927)
- [44] R Singh *Notes Rec. R. Soc. Lond.* **61** 333 (2007)
- [45] see Ref. [40]
- [46] see Ref. [23]
- [47] H Nielsen and K Nielsen (eds.) *The History of Thirteen Danish Nobel Prizes – Neighbouring Nobel* (Aarhus : Aarhus University Press) p586 (2001)
- [48] L A Ramdas, *J. Phys Edu.* **1** 2 (1973)
- [49] A S Ganesan *Indian J. Phys.* **4** 281 (1929)
- [50] C V Raman *Indian J. Phys.* **2** 388 (1927-1928)
- [51] G S Landsberg and L I Mandelstam *Comptes rendus* **186** 109 (1928)
- [52] see Ref. [3], R Singh *Nobel Laureate C V Raman's Work on Light Scattering* p267 (2004)
- [53] G Kueppers, P Weingart and N Ulitzk : *Die Nobelpreise in Physik und Chemie 1901-1929, Materialien zum Nominierungsprozess* (Bielefeld : BK Verlag GmbH) p25 (1982)
- [54] R Singh and F Riess *Curr. Sci.* **75** 965 (1998)
- [55] R Singh *Notes Rec. R. Soc. Lond.* **61** 333 (2007)
- [56] *ibid*