

Letters

Support for the Uspenskiis

The recent departures of Anatoly Shcharansky, Yuri Orlov, and Lev Goldfarb are bright spots in the otherwise discouraging picture for hundreds of refusenik scientists in the Soviet Union. A case in point is that of Inna Ioffe and her husband Igor Uspenskii, medical entomologists who applied for exit visas in 1979. Within 2 years they were both dismissed from their positions at the Martsinovskiy Institute of Medical Parasitology and Tropical Medicine of the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Health. They have been denied permission to publish, go on expeditions, and attend meetings, and have suffered the additional outrage of having their names expunged from doctoral dissertations they directed. Ioffe is now unemployed, while Uspenskii works as an elevator operator and translator.

Their desperate situation was the subject of a recent resolution by the membership of the Entomological Society of America and an address by the president of that body (1). Close to 150 entomologists and other scientists endorsed a petition calling for the granting of their exit visas in accordance with the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Helsinki Final Act to which the U.S.S.R. is a party (2).

This is a particularly auspicious time to make our concerns known to Soviet officials through our representative to the Vienna Followup Meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (3) and, given the new official policy of openness, to other appropriate political and scientific officials in the U.S.S.R. (4). Finally, we can correspond directly with the Uspenskiis and provide them with articles and books on medical entomology and acarology and professional society memberships (5). This will let the Uspenskiis, as well as the officials who are monitoring their mail, know that we have not forgotten them and that they still have professional standing.

MATTHEW H. GREENSTONE
Biological Control of Insects
Research Laboratory,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
P.O. Box 7629, Research Park,
Columbia, MO 65205

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. *Bull. Entomol. Soc. Amer.* 29 (No. 1), 63 (1983); *ibid.* 31 (No. 2), 6 (1985).
2. Committee of Concerned Scientists, Inc., news release, 23 December 1986.
3. Send letters and telegrams to Ambassador Warren Zimmermann, Chairman, U.S. Delegation to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe,

American Embassy, Vienna, APO New York, NY 09108.

4. Mr. Mikhail S. Gorbachev, Secretary General of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Central Committee, The Kremlin, Moscow, RSFSR, U.S.S.R.; Gennady I. Tomin, Chief, Moscow OVIR, Kolpachny Pereulok 9, Moscow, RSFSR, U.S.S.R.; Academician N. N. Blokhin, President, Academy of Medical Sciences, Ul. Solovka 14, Moscow 109801, RSFSR, U.S.S.R.; His Excellency Yuri V. Dubinin, Ambassador of the U.S.S.R., 1125 16 Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.
5. Drs. Inna Ioffe and Igor Uspenskii, Prospect Vernadskogo, Building 125, Apartment 237, 117571 Moscow, RSFSR, U.S.S.R.; for assistance in sending books and journals contact the Committee of Concerned Scientists, Inc., 330 Seventh Avenue, Suite 608, New York, NY 10001.

Transplantation of Neural Tissue from Fetuses

Several decades of experimental work with rodents, and recently with nonhuman primates, have shown that transplantation of fetal neural tissue holds the promise of great benefit to victims of serious neurological disorders (1). At a recent meeting* held to address ethical questions raised by the possibility of transplanting neural tissue obtained from human fetuses, the undersigned neuroscientists, ethicists, and lawyers concluded that retrieval of such tissue from fetal remains is analogous to the transplantation of organs or tissue obtained from adult human cadavers. Similarities include the fact that the donor is dead, and the expectation that there will be significant benefits for the recipient. These similarities suggest the appropriateness of using the same ethical and legal criteria now followed for cadaver transplantation.

It was also agreed, however, that there are dissimilarities between the treatments. First, although use of fetal remains for transplantation is legal in most states (in the United States), it is ethically controversial because of its association with abortion. Second, although parental consent to the donation of fetal remains is legally sufficient in most states, it may not be ethically sufficient. For these reasons, and because the use of neural tissue for transplantation is experimental, such transplantation in humans should be subject to careful review. This review should apply to transplantation supported either by nonfederal sources or by federal funds.

Points to consider in the review process include the need for (i) a clear separation between decisions related to the acquisition of tissue and decisions regarding the transplantation of tissue into a recipient; (ii) anonymity between donor and recipient, with the implication that donors and recipi-

*Sponsored by the Center for Biomedical Ethics, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, Cleveland, OH, 4 and 5 December 1986.

Try A New Approach to Life Sciences—Search STN International®!

Search STN International online to get effective answers to your life science questions. Stay current on new developments in fast-changing fields such as biotechnology, pharmaceuticals, forensic science, and immunology.

More than one-third of our CAS ONLINE® database contains life science information. Try BIOSIS Previews®, and our newest file, BIOCAS, the link between BIOSIS Previews and CAS ONLINE. All searchable with only one command language on STN!

Please fill out and clip this coupon today.

YES: Please rush me my FREE STN information packet.

Name _____

Organization _____

Address _____

Mail to:

**STN International
 Marketing, Dept. 33886
 2540 Olentangy River Road
 P. O. Box 02228
 Columbus, Ohio 43202 USA**



Circle No. 18 on Readers' Service Card