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. Hufbauer *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-

tist who is already of Nobel Prize class can now get away with blowing his own glassware, preparing his own standard reagents, answering his letters. . . ."

I know only one Nobel Prize winner. But he and countless other scientists I know do many routine but essential tasks like those described by Ziman. Consider the participants in Project Halo, who observed fluctuations in total ozone from Baja California to New England during the annular eclipse of 10 May 1994. Each of 21 Project Halo teams was equipped with an instrument that measures total ozone and water vapor. The teams included representatives from seven universities, the U.S. Geological Survey, two secondary school teachers, and amateur radio and astronomy groups. They performed a wide variety of routine tasks, repairs, and last-minute software fixes under serious time constraints, often in a field setting.

If Ziman is right, all the Project Halo participants are of Nobel Prize class. While the implications of this are pleasant to contemplate, isn't it more reasonable to assume that the vast majority of working scientists continue to perform the kinds of routine tasks listed by Ziman?

Forrest M. Mims III
Sun Photometer Atmospheric Network,
433 Twin Oak Road,
Seguin, TX 78155, USA

■

British Gene Therapy Center

A ScienceScope piece of 13 May (p. 895), commenting on Kay Davies' decision not to take up the post of director of the Medical Research Council's (MRC's) new Clinical Sciences Centre (CSC), reports a number of comments that appear to cast doubt on the future of research in the new Hammersmith Hospitals Trust.

Although we are disappointed about Davies' decision, we remain optimistic about the future of research in the new Trust. In particular:

- The MRC remains fully committed to the CSC; a replacement for Kay Davies is now being sought; and the new laboratory building, with excellent facilities, opens next month.
- The Royal Postgraduate Medical School, which has attracted the highest ratings in a number of recent reviews by the Higher Education Funding Council for England and the U.K. Department of Health, for example, remains at Hammersmith Hospital.
- The government's formula for funding the excess costs of postgraduate research is satisfactory.
- The new Trust, one of the largest in the National Health Science, is the dominant service provider in west London and has a powerful concentration of specialist services which will provide the patient flow required to sustain high-quality research. The Trust has adopted the academically led clinical directorate structure, which was one of the foundations of Hammersmith's success.
- The combination of Charing Cross with Hammersmith has brought additional strength in several important areas, notably neurosciences, cancer, and rheumatology.

For these reasons we do not share the pessimistic tone of the ScienceScope piece. The new Hammersmith Trust, with its associated postgraduate and undergraduate medical schools and institutes, is already a powerful force in research, service, and teaching. Now that the uncertainty as to site is behind us, we can build for the future.

Christopher Bland
Chairman,
Hammersmith Hospitals Trust,
Hammersmith Hospital,
Du Cane Road,
London W12 OHS, United Kingdom
Colin Dollery
Dean,
Royal Postgraduate Medical School,
Hammmersmith Hospital

■

Seaborgium: Name Not Yet Approved by ACS

E. Kenneth Hulet, in a statement (Letters, 22 April, p. 491) regarding the proposed name seaborgium for element 106, incorrectly says that the name has been accepted by the American Chemical Society (ACS) Committee on Nomenclature. The Committee on Nomenclature has asked the Nomenclature Committee of the ACS Inorganic Division, in consultation with the ACS Division of Nuclear Chemistry, to consider this proposed name and to report to the ACS Committee on Nomenclature at its annual meeting in November.

John A. Secrist III
Southern Research Institute,
Birmingham, AL 35255–5305, USA

Corrections and Clarifications

The News & Comment article "NSF eyes new South Pole station" by Jeffrey Mervis (24 June, p. 1836) mentioned the principal investigators of three of the four teams making up the Center for Astrophysical Research in Antarctica. The fourth is Mark Hereld, senior research associate at the University of Chicago, who is responsible for the South Pole Infrared Explorer telescope.