

## Conclusions

V.L. Telegdi, ETH Zurich

To summarize this Seminar is, for me as the chairman of ICFA, a rather delicate task. Were I a simple participant, foolhardy enough to accept the task of condensing the contents of 3 days of formal presentations and discussions into a short summary, then I would have more freedom to present my general impressions in addition to reciting facts and figures. Indeed, these facts and figures serve mainly to formulate scenarios, while the choice between these scenarios is the key issue where, at least at the present moment, emotional arguments were occasionally been evoked. Such arguments can be summarized only through impressions, and my own would be, of necessity, subjective, and thus ruled out of order. Fortunately -- or unfortunately, depending on one's ideology -- we have here reached the clear conclusion that ICFA's role should be to facilitate collaboration rather than to arbitrate between options.

ICFA is a creature of IUPAP, and both I's stand for "international", actually the I in ICFA rather signifies "interregional". Nevertheless, I shall reiterate that there are two kinds of internationalism, i.e. idealistic and pragmatic. The first, starting from the inherently transnational nature of science, wants to go international wherever possible -- perhaps to strengthen the bonds between different nations or to show the way for other undertakings. The second, the pragmatic one, wants to go international (or, really, interregional) only when forced by outer constraints to do so. This latter point of view, expressed by as great a leader in our field as R.R. Wilson, is not as embarrassing as it seems, CERN was founded for this reason, and emulated later by others, both within and without HEP. The comparison between comparable facilities in two regions could, as emphasized here by Boyce McDaniel, even be constructive. It should however not be forgotten that each of those regions would have to convince their authorities of this added advantage of "separate but equal". I should on the other hand add, as a summarizer,

that it was pointed out here (by T. Ekelof) that the "idealistic" approach has hidden pragmatic advantages. Time does not permit me to analyze these in detail.

The survey of on-going accelerator projects has convinced us that the world of high-energy physics will be swinging towards the end of the eighties or at worst at the beginning of the "naughty nineties", -- HERA, LEP, SLC, Tevatron and Tristan will all be running or in fact will have been running for a number of years! Nay, it is even probable, if not certain, that some striking discovery will already have been made at one or the other of these accelerators. It is only regrettable that another great and fundamentally distinct facility, UNK, is proceeding at a relatively slow rate. This remark is not intended as a criticism of our Soviet colleagues, who have shown themselves so inventive in accelerator physics (just think of phase stability, cooling, electron polarization, RF quadrupoles), but rather as a form of moral support by the international community.

Two more signs of health: 1) with HERA, a second major Western European center is launched with a new transnational way of financing which many here have proposed as a funding mode for anticipated interregional projects; 2) BEPC is proceeding well in Beijing, showing that China, a country with still so many "practical" needs to be fulfilled, has the wisdom to invest in the frontiers of science. As W.K.H. Panofsky has pointed out here, such comparatively small projects can have large value for the international community.

The two theoretical talks on Tuesday p.m., both delivered on and with energy and luminosity, were intended to show us the way where flowers bloom in the desert. To put it more bluntly, they gave us reasons for the energy scale that we ought to investigate in the "naughty nineties". Their main points were (a) that an "available" c.m. energy of 1-2 TeV is needed, (b) that this "available" energy is, for hadron colliders, only 1/5 to 1/10 of the total c.m. energy, and (c) that  $e^+e^-$  colliders might have, as seen by the theorists, some distinct advantages. It must be said that there is at present no detailed design and hence no price tag for a SSLC's of the requisite size. Nevertheless, this option, pursued with admirable persistence in Siberia, should not be lost out of sight for one

moment of the next few years.

It is well-known that, except for the Bevatron and the Sp $\bar{p}$ S, the glories of every accelerator have come from discoveries not predicted, or at least not emphasized, by theorists. "Who needs them?" might some intrepid voyagers exclaim (there are 1000 of them in Japan alone!). Their usefulness, at least in this context, is illustrated by the following anecdote.

Before telling it, I must explain that Austrians consider Germans to be pedantic and punctilious, while Germans think of Austrians as being sloppy and disorganized. A German tourist, riding on the Austrian railway, noticed that his train was 20 minutes behind schedule. He remarked to the conductor: "What a slovenly country! What do you people really need a time-table for?!" To which the conductor replied: "Sir, if we did not have a time-table, you would not know how late we are ...".

Anyhow, to quote myself, "Last year's (decade's) discovery is this year's (decade's) calibration", to which Feynman added "and next year's (decade's) background".

In the nineties, we -- that is the "hatched" group in my graph -- should then explore masses around 1-2 TeV, presumably with hadron colliders. Zacharov promised us SUSY particles at a mere bargain mass of 0.1 TeV, and he also emphasized that for large values of  $x$  the antiquark content of  $\bar{p}$ 's makes up for their smaller absolute flux.

The subsequent panel discussion on detector related machine and instrumentation issues taught us mainly two things: (1) The requested luminosities of the next generation of hadron colliders will stretch the current experimental techniques to their very limit, and, in some cases, perhaps beyond. (2) The megabit data flow might cause indigestion and perhaps even constipation. To throttle it by reducing the intake of luminosity is not a recommended, if expensive, remedy. In this context the critical comments of Carlo Rubbia, who has never posed as a pessimist, ought to be heeded.

Clearly this is an area where much effort, as coordinated as possible, is needed. It is also an area where cooperation between experimentalists and machine designers is more critical than ever. Fortunately, the panel convened here at KEK suggested that ICFA initiate

panels to promote international collaboration.

The talks on future options were rather different. The hadron colliders, SSC and LHC, were presented as well within the reach of current technologies, if not necessarily of current regional budgets (actually, the most ambitious option for the LHC would require the development of the technology for the series fabrication of 10-T superconducting magnets). The linear colliders, probably the most rewarding devices of this century, were viewed in different lights by the two leading experts. Skrinsky, proposing an evolutionary, say Darwinian, construction approach, was cautiously optimistic, while Richter, perhaps more along the Lysenko line, spoke very pedagogically, but with surprising understatement, about parameters for 1+1 TeV. As was later pointed out pointedly, the relatively close turn-on of the SLC may provide a shock treatment to its very originator and a benefit to all of us. Good luck, SLAC!

Having dedicated my Wednesday afternoon, together with one of our founding fathers, to Tokyo art galleries, I cannot honestly report on what was said. My personal knowledge of the speakers and my fear of making yet more enemies inspires me to say that the talks must have been excellent.

The Sessler panel on Future R&D cooperation produced the unanimous suggestion that ICFA had found itself another valuable task -- to organize standing panels for international collaboration in the following areas:

- A.1 Super-conducting Magnets and Cryogenics
- A.2 Super-conducting RF
- A.3 Surface and Material Physics related to Accelerator Technologies
- A.4 Beam Dynamics
- A.5 New Acceleration Schemes
- B.1 Instrumentation Innovation and Development
- B.2 Physics Advice on Future Requirements for New Accelerators.

In yesterday's meeting, as I have already had the pleasure to report, ICFA has agreed to do so either for at least several of these areas. This is a very positive step indeed.

We had a so-called "WHAT" panel discussing possible scenarios for the nineties. The frank exchanges that took place, in regard to the proposed

SSC and the potential LHC, prompted me earlier to refer to the "naughty" nineties. The interdependence of the projects, even if clearly meant as regional undertakings, was perhaps not sufficiently stressed by the panel, nor discussed by interventions from the floor. It should be noted that L. Lederman injected a note of internationalism by mentioning the possibility that the SSC be built a la HERA -- presumably however only in certain circumstances. Leon even called it a "possible VBA".

There are good reasons on both sides of the Atlantic for building these hadron colliders, and perhaps even good reasons for building them both. I am confident that the proper balance will be found by the time the next seminar of this type will be held, and I am relieved (but not necessarily happy) that it's not ICFA's job to arbitrate.

The final session was that of the "How" panel, which you might have called the "ways and means committee", followed by vigorous audience participation. As was pointed out, we can't use our know-how if we don't have a know-what. It did however not become ICFA's task to solve this logical puzzle, since it was agreed by a clear consensus that ICFA's charge was to facilitate the construction of new high-energy accelerators rather than to arbitrate between various national and regional options. This clarification, and the consequent simplification of our tasks, makes it easier and also more important to carry out those new tasks that have been handed to us with enthusiasm and vigor. There is, we all know it, no room in our field for people who lack these two qualities.

The greatness of our field lies not only in its uninterrupted chain of successes in uncovering and explaining the structure of matter on deeper and deeper levels, but also in the incessant rate at which novel techniques of acceleration and detection have so far always been invented and actually put into practice. If we don't want Livingston's exponential plot to flatten out, and we certainly do not, then we should not put all our hopes into the VBFA (very brute-force accelerator), but we should strive for a VBIA (very brilliant idea accelerator). I can forecast already how the VBIA might come about. The basic idea will probably be invented by an immigrant, from another country or region. The flaws of this idea will then be castigated and ultimately corrected by somebody in yet another region. Several regions will engage in a race to design a

practical accelerator, to the great benefit of all. ICFA will say that the VBFA is not the VBA in its charter, and will not arbitrate. The machine will however be built, perhaps a la HERA, and be freely accessible to rich and poor alike under ICFA guidelines. Perhaps the sole conclusion is that all countries of the world should allow free emigration and immigration.

It is now my pleasant duty to thank the local organizers of this seminar, in the name of all the participants, for their boundless efficiency, infinite kindness and unlimited hospitality. Everything was done by them to make our work effective and our stay pleasant, and they succeeded along both fronts admirably. Here is a list (hopefully complete) of the people we would like to thank in particular.

TETSUJI NISHIKAWA, Director General of KEK

YOSHIO YAMAGUCHI, Director of INS

SATOSHI OZAKI, Chairman of the Local Organizing Committee

S. KATOH, INS

K. TAKAHASHI, KEK

H. HIRABAYASHI, KEK

Scientific Secretaries,

K. ABE	Y. FUKUSHIMA	R. HAYANO	S. HIRAMATSU	S. INAGAKI
H. IWASAKI	S. IWATA	S. KABE	S. KAMATA	S. KAWABATA
S. KAZAMA	J. KISHIRO	M. KOBAYASHI	T. KONDO	M. KUMADA
S. KUROKAWA	A. MAKI	K. MARUYAMA	Y. MIURA	T. MIYACHI
Y. MIZUMACHI	M. MORIMOTO	K. NAKAJIMA	S. ODAKA	A. OGATA
T. OHSHIMA	H. OKUNO	Y. SHIMIZU	T. SUMIYOSHI	K. TAKAMATSU
F. TAKASAKI	C. TANAKA	T. TSURU	Y. UNNO	Y. WATANABE

and

Administration Department

Plant Engineering Department.

Sayonara, and thank you all.

# Birth-date Distribution of ICFA Participants

