

"science and the human condition." Very many others have been equally concerned, notably C. P. Snow.

I think Ellis was frank and clear in his editorial, and I must congratulate him for asking the reader two very challenging questions. He first asked if there is a relation between science and the human condition. Then he asked how scientists could demonstrate it. Indeed, these questions challenged me to write something in reply. But I must warn you that I can only speak for the science of physics and for myself. So when I mention "science," I hope you know in what way I mean it. And when I mention "scientist," I hope you know that the qualities of this person are essentially my own.

The first question asked for the relation of science and the human condition. I have to admit that I have trouble answering the question as it is phrased because I think science is a human condition. If you asked for the relevance of, say, physics, I would be tempted to think of your query as one concerning the relevance of a curiosity about the tangible, physical aspects of nature. Such a curiosity is a human condition. So naturally its relevance is as a human condition. It simply gives a man once trained in, say, the discipline of physics a way to enjoy being alive.

I think there is a type of man who is likely to be a physicist like myself. He is in love with nature. He wants only simple things like a chance to see a moose in the deep woods, a chance to see if his idea holds water about why a stream meanders in the mudflats or a chance to have close friends. He asks not for power, fame, wealth or lust because he does not trust them. He wants to inflict no harm on others. So he hopes with all his heart that his ideas will not be misused. And he is secretly glad that pure physics is hard to apply, and thus be misused. He does not envisage a world better than the present but rather hopes that this world could be protected and appreciated as the natural home of man. He knows his scientific method is powerful because it has performed most wisely for him. But he does not imagine it to be automatically a boon for the rest of human thinking because he knows he has ignored much about what other types of people do and so does not know whether his approach

is universally applicable. So he keeps quiet about it. If men want to examine his thinking he would be flattered to have them so interested. But he would be wary of them because he does not trust intangible abstractions. He trusts only what he can feel, hear, see or speak to. He believes that the relation between the human condition and science is tangible and thus not to be sought after through the abstract. For him the relation is simply that some men find themselves being very human as scientists just as others find themselves being very human as artists, physicians or carpenters.

As for the second question, which asks how scientists can demonstrate this relation to the "cold pedantic" humanist, let me caution scientists not to worry too much about it. Worrying will get them nowhere. Neither will a tardy attempt to become "humanistic scientists." Nor will a predictably futile attempt to win over some "scientific humanists." It is not easy to reveal your own way of loving life to one who thinks differently from you. All a fellow can really do is continue to be himself and hope to make some friends.

CHARLES PRINCE
Brown University

Abstracts on tape?

Our friends in the medical profession sometimes find themselves so busy that they take advantage of a service that provides small tape recordings of talks on technical subjects. They can listen to them while driving to make calls. I would like to suggest that the contents of *Physics Abstracts* might be read onto tape. The busy physicist could likewise listen as he drives about or as he works on his equipment. On hearing an abstract that he wishes to include in his field, he would listen for the abstract number (which would follow) and jot it down for reference. If putting all *Physics Abstracts* on tape would be too much to start with, perhaps just the titles could be read in. The tapes would be mailed out rapidly on a subscription basis for selected subjects.

RAY HEFFERLIN
University of Chattanooga

A CORRECTION: On page 97 of the May "Books" department Interscience was given as the publisher of *A Deductive Theory of Space and Time* by S. A. Basri. The publisher is North Holland Publishing Co. □



**Bendix makes
rugged electron
multipliers
this small.**

Who could ask for anything less?

Rugged and small. That's a Bendix electron multiplier for you. How rugged? It's impervious to ambient atmosphere. You can even wash it with common, grit-free cleaners. That's how tough the glass field and dynode strip coatings are.

How sensitive? To the extreme ends of the electromagnetic spectrum. Including the hard ultraviolet range unattainable by other detectors. Tungsten cathodes, unaffected by visible and near-ultraviolet radiation, allow broad use as a windowless, solar-blind detector for far ultraviolet and soft X-rays. Detection and counting of photons, ions, neutral particles and nuclear radiation, too.

Spectral response? 1500 Å to below 2 Å, with current gain reaching 10^8 . Rise time exceeds 5 nanoseconds. Maximum dark current is 1 picoamp.

Other models are available, too. All rugged, and as compact as can be. And that makes them naturals for rocket probes.

Power supply? Our matching Bendix Model 1122 is solid state for assured constant voltage and minimum maintenance.

More questions? Write: Scientific Instruments and Vacuum Division, The Bendix Corporation, 3625 Hauck Road, Cincinnati, Ohio 45241. Or phone (513) 772-1600.

