

**THE 23<sup>rd</sup> CONGRESS OF THE CHEMISTS AND TECHNOLOGISTS OF MACEDONIA****(with international participation)*****What's in a name?***

There's a certain paradox in cosmology, called Olbers paradox, related to the very fact that the night sky is dark (in the visible spectral region) and that our Universe is not eternal nonstatic, but rather had a beginning (in accordance with the Big Bang model, or creationism in general). Never mind the true significance of this phenomenon in cosmology; the term Olbers paradox has become known in social sciences as well, as a particular example of the (common?) practice in science and engineering that a phenomenon is seldom named after the person who really discovered/invented it. That's because Heinrich Wilhelm Olbers was not the first one who has presented argumentation and evidence that our Universe does not seem to be infinite, eternal and static. It was some 250 years ago before Olbers that Thomas Digges had pointed out to the same relevant arguments, but still Olbers has been given the credit for it. Perhaps he had stated it more clearly than Digges, but perhaps not... Despite the fact that from the previous context it appears that the "paradox" from the social sciences aspect might appear as a "bad (or unfair) example", there is a particular case for which I consider it to be a rather good example.

In the period from 8<sup>th</sup> till 11<sup>th</sup> of October this year, the **23<sup>rd</sup> Congress of Chemists and Technologists of Macedonia (with International Participation)** took place at the beautiful Ohrid lake shore. However, despite the name of the Congress, when one looks at the Book of abstracts, it can actually be seen that the Congress could have been better called an **International Congress of Physical and Engineering Sciences (with participation of the chemists and technologists of Macedonia)**.

But, what's in a name? Isn't the Olbers paradox everywhere around us (at least in some form)? But in this particular case, I consider it to be an excellent example, and I wish that this apparent "name issue" becomes even more pronounced in the future.

Despite the fact that the Organizing and Scientific committees have had a rather hard time in getting even modest funding for basic organizational issues, at the end everything went on very well. It is not the opinion of the members of the two committees – they were so much active and involved in activities of all kinds so I do not think they had enough time to think this over (at least during the Congress). But a large percentage of the guests approached us and expressed their satisfaction and gratitude concerning both organizational and scientific issues and themes covered in the Congress. Most of them also said that despite the tight schedule, everything was very relaxed (good for them, looking from aside).

We thus have every right to believe that the Olbers paradox in this case can be even more pronounced in the future.

And finally, last but not least – the numbers (what can I do? I simply LOVE numbers). More than 280 posters were presented, with participants from more than 15 countries. 13 plenary lecturers were invited (never mind THIS number, one of them cancelled in the last moment) and two tribute lecturers, from Russia, United Arab Emirates, Croatia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Serbia, Czech Republic and Macedonia. The posters were divided into the following sections: Analytical chemistry, Biochemistry, Bio- and food technology, Chemical engineering, Electrochemistry, Education, Environmental, Fuel and energy, Inorganic chemistry and technology, Metallurgy, Medical and pharmaceutical chemistry and engineering, Materials science and technology, Organic chemistry and technology, Physical chemistry, Polymers, Spectroscopy and structural chemistry and Textile.

Besides the welcome party, also several other practical Bromatology sessions were organized, usually in the later hours, finalizing ultimately with the Congress dinner, when numerous other issues, aside from science, were resolved (involving many "tricky" political issues).

It has always been the policy of Organizational Committees of the series of our congresses that the registration fee is kept at the lowest possible (and attainable) level, to allow the colleagues from poor countries (such as Macedonia) to be able to participate; this despite the lack of serious science funding. However, all that has been done seems to be a further promotion of the Olbers

paradox. Hoping for better times in our Country, for science and everything (including the night sky), we hope to see you again in 2016 – hopefully again at beautiful Ohrid lake shore.



Ljupčo Pejov  
Institute of Chemistry, Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics  
Skopje, Macedonia