



Offer your old cytocentrifuge early retirement

And then replace it with the new Wescor cytocentrifuge

Wescor's CYTOPRO™ system is the most innovative cytocentrifuge in years. It features an advanced sealed rotor design that combines exceptional ease of use with excellent cell recovery.

Many other design innovations make the programmable Cytopro system remarkably versatile, safe, and user-friendly. Consistent results, economically achieved. That's what to expect from the Cytopro system.

The Cytopro system not only works well in cytology, hematology and microbiology, but with any application involving cell suspensions. Any staining system may be used.

So forget the past and try today's cytocentrifuge. To arrange a demonstration or to receive more information, contact Wescor, Inc., 459 South Main Street, Logan, UT, 84321 USA. Toll-free **1-800-453-2725**. FAX 801-752-4127.

WESCOR®

Circle No. 20 on Readers' Service Card

cow, work with them and their students, give lectures, plan with them, and show them that we respect and trust them as fellow scientists. Let them feel that they really belong to the world community of science with first-class membership. Plan and start scientific projects together concerning Russian development potential or problems; invite young students, whom you more or less have picked yourself, to your own lab and country; educate them in your own country within the framework of the project you have started together; and send them back with grants and facilities to continue and finish the project. This will give them a real incentive to go home again, which otherwise can be difficult.

Lars Christersson
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences,
S-750 07 Uppsala, Sweden

Current address: College of Forestry, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA.

Revelle on Global Warming

Having been Roger Revelle's closest junior colleague during his final years, I feel it my duty to clarify that his actual views about global warming were not represented by his mistaken statements published in a 1991 *Cosmos* article (1) (*ScienceScope*, 3 June, p. 1391).

In 1992, I served on an editorial board charged with considering republication of the *Cosmos* article as a book chapter (2). I protested that it failed our editorial criteria because it was less than objective and inadequately referenced. Moreover, I saw little social benefit in publishing an article in which Revelle had so obviously committed a major blunder in the key scientific statement at the core of the article.

The *Cosmos* article predicts that the most likely warming in the next century would be "well below the normal year-to-year variation . . ." (emphasis added). In an earlier *Scientific American* article (3), Revelle recognized that the normal year-to-year variation in global average temperature has been only 0.2 degrees Celsius. I knew Revelle to believe in 1991 that the likely average global warming in the next century would be in the range of 2 to 3 degrees Celsius, with even greater warming at the higher latitudes. In fact, he had opened a 1990 address to the AAAS by saying there was a good chance that the world's average climate would become significantly warmer during the next century (4). This major discrepancy convinced me, and still does, that the *Cosmos* article did not represent Revelle's view and that a serious mistake went uncorrected.

My commentary should defer to the evidence. Documents and testimony produced

through the lawsuit brought against me by S. Fred Singer will be preserved in the archives of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography. Included are original drafts, related articles (5), the galley proof version bearing Revelle's handwritten comments, a sworn affidavit of Revelle's personal secretary, and sworn testimony of Singer.

Justin Lancaster
6 Valley Road,
Lexington, MA 02173, USA

References

1. S. F. Singer, R. Revelle, C. Starr, *Cosmos* 1, 28 (1991).
2. R. Geyer, Ed., *A Global Warming Forum* (CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1993).
3. R. Revelle, *Sci. Am.* 247, 38 (August 1982).
4. ———, *Oceanography* 2, 126 (1992).
5. S. F. Singer, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 24, 1138 (1990); W. H. Munk and E. Frieman, *Oceanography* 3, 125 (1992); C. R. Huftbauer et al., *Washington Post* (13 September 1992), p. C7; B. J. Hurley, Ed., *Global Environ. Change Rep.* 6, 1 (14 January 1994).

DOE Peer Review

The 20 May *ScienceScope* item "DOE peer review ruled illegal" (p. 1071) may have left the reader with the incorrect impression that the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Basic Energy Sciences program is "not usually peer reviewed." That statement is not true. The review under discussion was an *additional* review. Although its substance was greatly flawed, the DOE General Counsel was only asked to examine the compliance of the methodology of this panel-type review with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Wastefulness resulted because management wanted to review each and every individual project on top of the initial peer reviews, rather than to set an objective for the additional review and to end it after its accomplishment. The objective seemed to be multipronged and to vary from day to day. A sampling, if done properly, might have served some purpose. Although started in the Bush Administration, the additional review was continued well into the Clinton Administration, and was terminated after I left DOE—far short of having covered all the projects. That fact is a measure of its usefulness.

Louis Ianniello
20006 Holly Pond Way,
Gaithersburg, MD 20879, USA

Noblesse Oblige

John Ziman, in a Vignette (22 Apr., p. 603) quoted from *Prometheus Bound: Science in a Dynamic 'Steady State'* (Cambridge University Press, 1994), states, "Only a scien-