



**You Are
Invited to Attend
the 1999**

INDUSTRIAL PHYSICS FORUM

**for Corporate &
Academic Leaders**

sponsored by

the AIP Corporate Associates,
The Industrial Physicist, & The APS Forum on
Industrial Applications of Physics

**Technological Innovation
for Energy in a
World without Walls**

hosted by

EXXON RESEARCH & ENGINEERING
October 25-26, 1999
Clinton, New Jersey

THEME SESSION:

Markets & technology, resource exploration, innovation
in energy, ultra high strength steels, physics at chemical
engineering interface

ON-SITE TOUR:

Exxon Corporate Research

POLICY SESSION:

Environmental Drivers and Energy Technology
Future resources & environment, CO₂ management
technology, ground transportation plants

FRONTIERS OF PHYSICS:

Protein folding, cascading lasers, accelerating Universe,
self assembly

Registration Fee: \$250 (includes all meals)
Sessions Only: \$170
One day of sessions: \$100
Companion meals: \$90

To register or obtain further meeting information, contact:

Office of the Executive Director
American Institute of Physics
One Physics Ellipse
College Park, MD 20740-3843
Tel. 301-209-3135 or Fax 301-209-3133
<assoc@aip.org>

Or visit the Corporate Associates Homepage
on the AIP Website:
<<http://www.aip.org/aip/corporate/>>

**AMERICAN
INSTITUTE
OF PHYSICS**

quantum mechanics. Of course, when you solve one difficulty, other new difficulties arise. You then try to solve them. You can never solve all difficulties at once."

There is also the story of a prominent mathematician, who is also a religious Jew. During a period of hot debates on evolution versus creationism, he was asked whether he believed in evolution. He answered, "Of course. It is good science." When asked whether he believed the story of the creation in the Bible, he said, "Of course. I believe what is written in the Bible." But wasn't this a contradiction? "Of course it is a contradiction. We don't understand it. But life is full of contradictions that we don't understand. We have to live with them."

I often remember the words I used to hear from my father whenever I thought I was being very clever: "If you would know what you don't know, you would know more than you know."

This will always be true.

HARRY J. LIPKIN

(ftlipkin@wiswizc.weizmann.ac.il)
Weizmann Institute of Science
Rehovot, Israel

A comment to add to the discussion about postmodern social scientists using secondary sources to determine the whys and whats of physics (see, for example, Mara Beller's article in your September 1998 issue). Imagine some aliens who do not experience sex coming to Earth and studying us in this respect. Imagine their attempt at a scientific description of the behavior of humans in love, and in sex, without their having a clue as to what love and sex do for Earthlings. It would be a very strange treatise, without much chance of any of it being right. Why, we don't really need aliens! Wasn't it Immanuel Kant who stated that sex "requires positions unworthy of a philosopher"? He made other pronouncements, too—such as one about the existence of absolute time and space—that failed and that he also arrived at by thinking alone, not by practicing.

Individuals who try to make an academic discipline out of talking about science without knowing it, and without understanding how things fall into place with a correct postulate, remind me of those cartoons about love and sex in which the old geezer says, "I know I like it but I don't remember why." Except that many social scientists don't like "it."

INGA KARLINER

(karliner@uiuc.edu)
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

US Federal Scientists Shouldn't Get Free Passage to India

With respect to the US Department of Energy having turned down travel requests from eight US scientists to attend the 13th Topical Conference on Hadron Collider Physics at a research institute in India in mid-January, as reported in your March story (page 75), may I cast a vote in support of DOE?

As a semiretired industrial physicist and research manager, I see no reason why such scientists should have their way paid to a country with which the US—their employer, "in loco taxpayers"—is quite rightfully upset. Nor, in fact, do I see the merit of taxpayers subsidizing the mass junkets of government scientists even to friendly countries.

In this particular case, from the US point of view, the cause of scientific exchange was hardly harmed, for our scientists are surely free to request funds to travel to other conferences, both at home and abroad. Rather, the loss was primarily that of the Indian scientists, and—in my opinion—that was the intent.

Have I missed something? Isn't it the predominant view among members of our science organizations that nuclear weapons are bad and we should do everything we can to eliminate them? How does our posturing about scientific exchange lead to discouraging India—or Pakistan, Israel, or any other country—from developing even more deadly weapons of mass destruction?

My hat is off to the unnamed Fermilab researcher mentioned in your story who attended the conference in India at his own expense. At least we know that he was serious about science—or India.

ROBERT A. MYERS

(myers@frlicense.com)
New York, New York

Corrections

March, page 117—George C. Baldwin's letter was inadvertently printed without its headline: "Advances Made in Synchrotron Radiation Deserve to Be Prized."

April, page 60—The November 1996 loss of the HETI-I spacecraft was due to a power failure on an Orbital Sciences Pegasus XL rocket, not an Ariane-5 rocket as stated in the third footnote of the table on the budgets of NASA's physics-related programs. ■