of federal policy on potassium iodide that would serve as guidance to states developing emergency plans.

Without this guidance from federal agencies, many states will be less likely to purchase potassium iodide for the general population, and those living near nuclear power plants will not have the option to protect themselves from a preventable disease. The fact that some states, including Tennessee, Vermont, and Alabama, have purchased potassium iodide to protect the general population despite the lack of federal guidance attests to the seriousness of this issue and to the fact that federal guidance is long overdue.

SIDNEY WOLFE
CARY LACHEEN
Public Citizen Health Research Group, 2000 P Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036

References

1. L. E. Holm, G. Lundell, C. Wallinder, *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* **64**, 1055 (1980).
2. E. Ron and B. Modan, *ibid.* **65**, 7 (1980).
3. *Fed. Regist.* **47** (125) 28158 (29 June 1982).
4. "The use of iodine as a thyroidal blocking agent in the event of a reactor accident" (American Thyroid Association, Worcester, Mass., 18 September 1981).
5. *Reactor Safety Study: An Assessment of Accident Risks in U.S. Commercial Nuclear Power Plants* (Report Wash 1400, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C., 1975).
6. R. S. Yalow, "Risks in mass distribution of KI," paper presented at the Endocrine Society Symposium "Potassium Iodide: Good or Evil After Nuclear Accidents," Washington, D.C., 18 June 1980.
7. R. Krimm, assistant associate director, Office of Natural and Technological Hazards, Federal Emergency Management Agency, testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, subcommittee on oversight and investigations (97th Congr., 2nd. sess., 5 March 1982), p. 1.
8. B. Grimes, director, Division of Emergency Preparedness, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, subcommittee on oversight and investigations (97th Congr., 2nd sess., 5 March 1982), p. 3.

Oil Consumption

Philip H. Abelson, in his editorial "Energy for Western Europe" (23 July, p. 309), says that a combination of conservation, improved energy efficiency, and substitution of alternative sources of energy for oil has reduced imports markedly. In fact, what appears to have had the greatest impact on reducing imports has been the decrease in economic activity. Manufacturing capacity utilization in the United States is down from 85 percent in 1979 to 68 percent as of last June, with the production of durable goods dropping 16 percent during this period (*1*). Total oil consumption, however, is projected to only decrease approximately 11 percent this year, assuming some economic improvement in the second half of 1982 (*2*). Yet oil imports are projected to be only 4.5 million barrels per day this year (*2*) as compared to 8 million barrels per day in 1979 (*3*). Unfortunately, rather than heralding a large increase in domestic oil production, this is due to the consumption of inventories acquired in 1981.

Certainly the factors Abelson mentions have had an effect on U.S. oil consumption, but it appears that they are outweighed by the effects of the low level of economic growth and inflation. When the economy regains its strength, oil consumption and imports will once again rise dramatically. The nation will again be devastatingly vulnerable to the loss of a vital commodity, having not used this period of relatively stable oil prices and supplies to accelerate the development of oil substitutes. As noted in a recent study (*4*), it is necessary to move boldly to replace oil with coal- and nuclear-generated electricity, oil shale, and liquids and gases from coal.

THEODORE M. BESMANN
Chemical Technology Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

References

1. *New York Times*, 25 July 1982, p. E4.
2. Energy Information Administration, *Short-Term Energy Outlook* (DOE/EIA-0202, Department of Energy, Washington, D.C., 1982).
3. *Mon. Energy Rev.* January 1982, p. 32.
4. R. S. Livingston, T. D. Anderson, T. M. Besmann, M. Olszewski, A. M. Perry, C. D. West, *A Desirable Energy Future* (Franklin Institute Press, Philadelphia, 1982).

The LEP Experiment

William J. Broad, in his article (News and Comment, 20 Aug., p. 710) on a possible controversy over U.S. support of experiments at the LEP accelerator in Europe, quotes only a part of what I have said to him, to the High Energy Physics Advisory Panel, and to many other physicists. This turns my position, which some have even called bland, into something that (to use Broad's words) would "kick up a certain amount of dust between two Nobel laureates in the United States."

To set the record straight, I fully support international scientific collaboration in high energy physics, and I have done a considerable amount of work to expand this collaboration. In the past the collaboration has resulted in the export overseas (principally to Europe) of about 10 percent of U.S. funds that go to university research groups in the United States. This overseas effort has on the average been balanced by work done by foreign groups in the United States. Five to 10 years ago Europe was the main source of foreign groups working in the United States. Recently the European effort here has decreased while the Japanese effort has increased, and the system still is in rough balance. The system is a healthy one for science, for it allows an important cross-fertilization as well as allowing physicists from all regions to follow their interests and to use facilities of a kind that may not be available near home.

Ting's request for $20 million over a period of 4 to 5 years for the U.S. share of the construction of a major LEP facility is the latest in a long line of requests for the support of work overseas. Looked at on a yearly basis, it is a large but not an enormous amount of money. It is a truism to say that his request must be examined on its merits and in light of available resources—all requests for funds are examined on these bases.

I also believe that requests for funds for overseas work should be monitored carefully, for these requests are a symptom of the health of the national program. Very roughly, 75 percent of U.S. funds for high energy physics goes to support the three big laboratories (Brookhaven, Fermilab, and SLAC), where nearly all of the U.S. experimental programs are carried out. The remainder goes principally to support the university groups that do most of the experimental work. A persistent and significant increase in funds exported from the United States by university groups would seem to me to be a clear sign that the U.S. program may face a combination of serious problems: our facilities might be becoming obsolete, we might not be building the right new facilities in a timely manner, or we might not be supporting accelerators here with enough funds to allow sufficient running time for the experimental groups that want to use these machines. I think that we face more than one of these problems.

BURTON RICHTER
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305

Erratum: In the article "Critical care at Tianjin's First Central Hospital and the Fourth Modernization" by Renée C. Fox and Judith P. Swazey (20 Aug., p. 700), in the third paragraph on page 703, the word "atrioventricular" should have been "arteriovenous."

Erratum: In the book review by T. J. M. Schopf (30 July, p. 438), the statement that "titles of the articles are not included in the references" of *Genome Evolution* (G. A. Dover and R. B. Flavell, Eds., Academic Press, New York, 1982) is incorrect; titles are lacking in only one of the reference lists in the book.