

rich enough to meet the country's power needs for centuries, no matter how much energy consumption may grow. (Emphasis has been added)

We can not wonder that the American people are confused about the energy crisis.

ALBERT A. BARTLETT
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

5/12/78

Even fewer students

In his article "The APS in 1977" in April (page 23) George Pake gives a projection of the college age population as a function of time up to the year 2000. The projection shows a decline from a peak of 18 million in 1980 to a figure of 14 million in 1990 followed by an upturn to about 18.5 million in 2000. Pake points out this 1977 projection is an appreciable downward revision of an earlier 1964 projection.

Unfortunately for the future market for physics teachers, this 1977 projection is also almost certainly too high. If the current fertility rates of 1.7-1.8 (births per woman) are maintained until 1982, the college age population (18-21 years) in the year 2000 will be slightly above 13 million people.¹ Immigration is included in this estimate.

It should be noted that the current college age population is about 16 million.

Reference

1. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1977*, US Dept. of Commerce (September 1977); page 6.

GERALD M. DANIELS
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Lincoln Laboratory
Lexington, Massachusetts

5/1/78

Opportunities in sales

On the subject of career opportunities for physicists, I wonder how many are aware of a terrible shortage of highly qualified sales personnel in the high-technology industries. Not just door-knockers, or even "sales engineers," but people with an ability for quick understanding of a novel complex problem of a customer, who knows what can and cannot be done technically, who can devise a proposed solution, write it up as a proposal, persuade the customer to buy, and then follow up afterward.

As president of a company that needs such people, I know how very scarce they are. As a professor of physics (University of Pittsburgh), I also know the abundance of people on their second or third temporary soft-money postdoc appointment, and the concerns of the assistant professor with no chance of getting tenure. Some changing of career goals can help solve both problems.

Being a "Technical Representative" is certainly not for everyone. But for the person with a few years of good diversified post-doctoral experience, who likes to interact persuasively with people and has a good personality and appearance, who enjoys bouncing from one technical challenge to another, who can write, who would like an income potential substantially better than that of the average practicing scientist and perhaps eventually want to move into corporate management, and practice a profession that is in demand while using his physics background, this new career should be considered. The career opportunities in technical representation will expand just as surely as technology will.

I will be glad to go into more detail about this new field of opportunity for physicists with anybody who wants to know more, with the warning in advance that if his background is right, he is apt to get a job offer.

WADE L. FITE
Extranuclear Laboratories, Inc.
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

5/4/78

Technical controversies

Controversies on several scientifically oriented topics appear to have led to unreconcilable and almost uncontrolled debate in the political arena and in the letters sections of several publications. Demonstrations and counter-demonstrations also continue to be used to emphasize particular points of view. At the time of the writing of this letter, energy legislation proposed by President Carter had been languishing in Congress for about 15 months, largely because most senators and representatives apparently endorse what they believe to be the best regional interests of their constituents rather than trying to reach an understanding as to what is in the best interests of the nation as a whole. The nuclear-energy debate appears to have no possible satisfactory conclusion. Other controversies include the pitting of ecological and environmental proponents against advocates of economic growth, the so-called "soft" energy path advocates against the "hard" energy path advocates, and debates over the B-1 bomber, the neutron bomb and military equipment sales to the Middle East. Often in these debates "experts" with scientific background appear to contradict one another. The contradictions often seem to arise because the experts do not clearly indicate when they are no longer quoting facts but are expressing opinions. Sometimes I wonder if they are themselves aware of the transformation.

Occasionally a decision has been reached, at least temporarily. In one such decision Congress decided shortly after World War II to establish the Atomic

Energy Commission with the express purpose of developing nuclear energy. We can look in retrospect and wonder if that decision was wise, but we must remember that hindsight always has a better chance of being correct than foresight. Even in hindsight only three possible decisions existed for the Congress at that time, since only coal, solar energy and nuclear energy existed in sufficient quantities to provide viable alternatives to oil and natural gas.

One may ask why Congress did not establish a Solar Energy Commission at the time it established the Atomic Energy Commission. However, in the late 1940's we already had enough experience to know that the per-kilowatt initial capital costs of solar energy were extremely large, at least in comparison with the capital costs of fossil-fueled electric power stations. On the other hand we were flushed with success from our one application of nuclear energy in World War II. The development of nuclear weapons had been so easy that it appeared likely that peaceful uses of nuclear energy could also be made into a relatively easy success story. It was impossible to foresee all the political, environmental and economic controversies that would rage regarding nuclear energy during the next few decades.

As I look at the many current controversies that require some degree of scientific or technical knowledge, I sometimes wonder if we still possess the capability to do long-range planning of the type we need to maintain a reasonably decent standard of living. Controversies appear to be growing both in numbers and in complexity. I see no real ability in any agency of the Federal government or in any other group to settle them. Indecision may prevail even more strongly in Congress than in the Executive Branch and among the general public. These observations lead me to wonder how long our democracy can survive before it is inundated by its inability to make decisions, especially decisions that require the use of scientific and technical information of a reasonably sophisticated nature.

C. SHARP COOK
University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, Texas

7/5/78

Author-written abstracts

In reply to the letter from Andrzej Krasinski in March (page 15), I would like to point out that there is an alternative to *Physics Abstracts*. The American Institute of Physics publishes the quarterly *Current Physics Index*, which is not comprehensive in its journal coverage (it covers about 90% of the US physics literature) but instead gives the abstracts in exactly the form written by the authors and for the major American journals