


Fast publication



highest visibility

Latest articles FREE

This service allows non-subscribers to the journal to have free access to the full online edition of the most recent issues of these 2 journals (30 days from the date of online publication of the articles). This service is devoted to individuals for their private studies, scholarship or research, without any commercial benefit.



www.edpsciences.org

the saturation of the neutrino sum rule for small four-momentum transfer q^2 , Frederick Gilman and I pointed out that saturation of the neutrino sum rule for large q^2 would require a new component in the deep inelastic cross section, one that did not fall off with form-factor squared behavior. Bjorken became interested in saturation of the sum rule, and he formulated several preliminary models that had hints of the dominance of a regime in which the energy transfer grows proportionately to q^2 . At the 1967 Solvay Conference, in response to questions about saturation of the neutrino sum rule, I summarized Bjorken's pre-scaling proposals. The precise saturation mechanism was clarified some months later with Bjorken's proposal⁴ of scaling, and soon afterward with the SLAC experimental work on deep inelastic scattering.

The Bjorken scaling hypothesis, and its reinterpretation using parton-model ideas inspired by Richard Feynman, led to powerful theoretical tools for analyzing deep inelastic scattering. For instance, Curtis Callan and Gross used scaling to derive a proportionality relation between two of the deep inelastic structure functions, under the assumption of dominance by spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ constituents (partons).

Wu-Ki Tung and I, and independently Roman Jackiw and Giuliano Preparata, soon showed that in perturbative quantum field theory there would be logarithmic deviations from the Callan-Gross relation. In other words, only free field theory would give exact scaling; in Gell-Mann's memorable phrase, "Nature reads the books of free field theory." That recognition, together with the proposal by William Bardeen, Harald Fritzsch, and Gell-Mann of a tripling of fractionally charged quarks,⁵ and new developments in the renormalization group, set the stage for a search for field theories that would have almost free behavior; the resulting discovery of asymptotic freedom in Yang-Mills theories gave the only case that worked.

References

1. W. I. Weisberger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **14**, 1047 (1965); S. L. Adler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **14**, 1051 (1965).
2. S. L. Adler, *Phys. Rev.* **143**, 1144 (1966).
3. G. F. Chew, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **19**, 1492 (1967).
4. J. D. Bjorken, *Phys. Rev.* **179**, 1547 (1969).
5. W. A. Bardeen, H. Fritzsch, M. Gell-

Mann, CERN preprint TH 1538, 21 July 1972; reissue available at <http://www.arXiv.org/hep-ph/0211388>.

Stephen L. Adler
(adler@ias.edu)

*Institute for Advanced Study
Princeton, New Jersey*

Physics or Politics?

Jim Dawson's piece on the election results (PHYSICS TODAY, January 2005, page 24), in which he suspects the winning party will seek revenge, was appalling, out of line with a professional journal. That some scientists supported John Kerry is their opinion. As John Marburger said, polarization during elections is part of our public process. Whether we backed one candidate or another should not affect our professional decisions or public sentiments. Otherwise, how can we maintain competence and credibility? As a self-employed consultant for more than 30 years, I have found credibility to be crucial to my practice.

The reason that national funding of academia is often limited is that academic research may be inefficient in the national scene. Few physicists heeded the message that OPEC sent to the world in 1974. The present Iraq war likely stems from that oversight. Where have the biomass fuel exponents in physics been for the last 30 years? Must the US again spend too late and too much to assure energy supplies now amid Homeland Security Department costs, simply because we didn't go green on energy needs 30 years ago, with academia leading the way?

I recall a physics class circa 1950, in which a PHYSICS TODAY representative announced the magazine's creation—a good idea, I thought. Has half a century reduced you to yellow journalism to obtain national funding of physics? Are you out of touch with the majority of Americans?

Stick to the technical facts. Just tell us what is going on today in physics and related fields, and leave the politics to others.

Angelo Campanella
(a.campanella@att.net)
Columbus, Ohio

Dawson replies: Science may be clean, cold, and objective, but it exists in a world that is anything but. When scientists form significant groups—the 48 Nobel laureates, for example—to endorse one candidate over another, PHYSICS TODAY should