

PHYSICS

The Electron is Real

Minute Phenomena Such as Atoms, Although Unfamiliar, Are Just as Real as the Stars, Says Sir Arthur Eddington

THE PHYSICAL world does exist, Sir Arthur Eddington, the British scientist, assured University of Chicago scientists, "if by exist is meant to have a structural representation inferred from the scientific relations derived from sense perceptions."

But to the question: "Is it the only world that exists?" Sir Arthur replied: "Who knows?"

The search for truth is confused by a body of inaccurate knowledge, Sir Arthur explained. He compared the communication between the external world and the mind to a "story-teller's" free translation of a cipher. The senses receive a set of signals transmitted by nerves to the conscious mind, where an inaccurate decoding occurs.

The difficult task of physical science is to infer knowledge from the code messages received. Physical science does not concern itself with the mind and transcendental notions. It deals only with the cryptograms presented for solution, and endeavors to discover the recurring regularities, which are apparent to many different minds.

An important feature in the unraveling process is the redundancy of the senses. Physical science has striven for unification by reducing the number of the senses reporting messages, and selecting the sense perceptions which are mathematical in nature, such as the reading of a galvanometer. In the scientific world there are no colors, there are only numbers corresponding to different colors, as there are numbers in a telephone directory corresponding to different individuals.

One Color-blind Eye

Up to the time of the appearance of Einstein's relativity theory, the ideal scientific observer had been a creature whose only sense organ was one color-blind eye, able to look only in one direction, distinguish between white and black, and recognize spatial form and size. Einstein further mutilated this creature by removing the ability to recognize spatial form and size, and leaving it only a small patch of retina able

to observe when a pointer coincides with a scale reading.

Such an idealized observer would make a competent astronomer, Sir Arthur contended. In his observatory a telescope focusses star light on a photoelectric cell which actuates an electrometer needle, changing its coincidence with one scale reading to coincidence with another scale reading, while the hand of a stop-watch behaves similarly. So the intensity of the light of a star would be inferred. So the glory of the heavens has been reduced to pointer readings, and the familiar "story teller" has been expelled as a false god.

From these pointer readings can we infer anything but relations between pointer readings? Yes, Sir Arthur answers, the intellect demands a structure which is independent of these relations. According to Einstein's terminology the pointer readings give us world-line intersections. We may use any structural representation which leaves the world-line intersections invariant. There is, indeed, a fluidity of representation for saying what we observe in terms of the data from the physical world.

No Longer Simple

This is the epoch-making discovery of Einstein's relativity theory, which revolutionized scientific thought. In its ordinary course of progress science found this multiplicity of representation, so that time and space are no longer the simple, axiomatic pictures presented by the "story-teller."

The philosopher might have arrived at this conclusion centuries before. To him the physicist is a slow, thick-headed workman muddling along. To the physicist, on the other hand, the philosopher is an officious spectator, offering tools before ability to use them has been achieved.

The theory of relativity deals with macroscopic phenomena such as are familiar to the "story-teller." The quantum theory is concerned with less familiar phenomena of minute substances such as the atom and the electron. The point of view that there is a difference between these two sets of phenomena,

such as for example, between a star and an electron, or that an atom is "unverifiable" is unwarranted in Sir Arthur's opinion.

"If I have seen a star, I have seen an electron," he said. There is no difference in the reality of a star seen as a bright spot surrounded by a diffraction pattern and of an electron observed as a track in a Wilson cloud-chamber.

If the physical world is an hypothesis, the star and the electron are hypotheses; if the physical world exists the star and the electron exist.

Indeterminism Reconciles

The rise of indeterminism in modern physics is healing the broad breach between experimental physics and philosophy, Sir Arthur Eddington told a scientific audience at Cornell University.

Indeterminism is making possible the reconciliation of the physicist's idea of the universe with that of the layman gleaned from purely human reactions to environment.

Science has abandoned the theory of determinism, based on the laws of cause and effect, and has thus destroyed the strongest defense of philosophical determinism which bases its denial of free will upon the absoluteness of physical law. The freedom of mind and will is wholly fictitious if the body must obey physical laws which state that all physical action is an unbreakable chain of cause and effect following inevitably one from the other, but now that this chain is no longer unbreakable, such freedom may no longer be fictitious.

The amount of indeterminism at present admitted in physics is not yet sufficient to justify a scientific theory of free will, Sir Arthur said. Science can still locate an electron within an inch and a half after it has been travelling 10,000 miles, which distance it has covered in a second, while for larger aggregates of matter the accuracy is so great as to be almost certainty. In fact, classical laws, based on causality, are so nearly scientifically accurate that they are not considered invalid but as stating the truth in the special case, where the number of units considered is almost infinitely large. Science does not disprove classic laws, but is no longer based on them but on statistical laws.

Showing the difference between the two laws, Sir Arthur gave two illustra-

