when both sexes are encouraged to try and both sexes are reinforced in the belief that they can succeed. Until we can either remove our cultural sexual bias or construct an experimental plan that can statistically determine the bias, the existence of a predisposition must remain an open question and cannot be assumed to be a fact. In the meantime, Ciparick introduces a "fact" that increments by one the number of microinequalities that women are consistently subjected to and that they have repeatedly reported as being a part of the largest barrier they face in science today. In short, he is part of the problem.

Further, as a fundamentalist religious person I reject his "fact" that as such I have accepted "the dogmatic authority of Scripture with no questions asked." Indeed I am as capable of discerning logical errors in my personal religious beliefs as I am of discerning Ciparick's logical errors and inconsistent arguments.

I strongly urge Ciparick and others who share his beliefs to understand in what sense such "facts" are really excuses for poor research, and poor research leads only to poor science.

LOUISE PERKINS
University of Southern Mississippi
8/93 *Stennis Space Center, Mississippi*

Scientists Should Heed George Brown's Thesis

There is an ergodic theorem that applies to old physicists; namely, if you live long enough, everything will have happened to you. I have been a practicing scientist, the chair of a university physics department, an academic dean, a vice president and provost at several universities and the executive director of a Congressional authorizing committee with jurisdiction over virtually all Federally financed civilian R&D. I support science, big and small, with no reservation or hesitation.

From my vantage point, I have seen few legislators over the years who have been as good a friend to science and scientists as George Brown, chairman of the House Committee on Science, Space and Technology. Further, I see no one on the current scene who compares to him.

Thus I am dismayed by the apparent disgruntled rancor and sense of betrayal evinced by many in the academic community with respect to Brown's recent speeches and editorials on the role of the scientist in society. Apparently some scientists feel resentment that an enlightened representative, elected by a disparate set of voters, does not lead a science claque. That should not be his role or responsibility. Personally I believe that it is *our* (the scientists') obligation to persuade Brown's colleagues, through such actions as the APS program of regular Congressional visits, that science is affordable and as close to being a panacea for society's ills as we have any prospect of finding.

I believe that Brown's thesis on the responsibility of scientists is a most appropriate injection of reality into a debate often rooted in fantasy as to what the nation must do for scientists. George Brown is a complete public servant and, at the same time, a staunch defender of science. If he has chosen to speak to us about the social responsibility that must undergird our priorities in research, we would do well to recognize that he is being pragmatic and, I might add, patriotic.

HAROLD P. HANSON
University of Florida
10/93 *Gainesville, Florida*

Physicists' Long Hours Limit Job Numbers

The changes in the economy of the United States and many other nations have resulted in a situation where it is difficult for physicists and engineers to find employment opportunities in industry. There have been a number of letters addressing this situation from various viewpoints in PHYSICS TODAY over the past few years, but I have not seen reference to the practice in industry of "exempting" professional salaried employees from the 40-hour week that applies to hourly wage workers. It seems to me that this practice must have a significant impact on the number of people required to carry out a development program in a specified time frame, and thus on the number of professional employment opportunities.

As a recently retired physicist, I have been a "beneficiary" of this exempt status over the past 30 years. I have worked many 60-hour weeks and sometimes went over 100 hours a week when an urgent "fix" was needed. Much of the work was interesting, and the urgency of certain schedules was evident, so I do not state this as a complaint. However, it is evident that if employers had to pay overtime for such work, and if other current disincentives to hiring additional staff were removed, significantly more technical people could be employed.

It seems to me that reducing the