Most letters have expressed approval of *Science's* "new format"—"enticing," "thoughtful," "terrific," "more readable." A few are less complimentary. A writer urges scientists to "cease being intimidated by congressional aides," and support their own agenda. A warning is issued that a "mixture" described in a recent report is "shock-sensitive and highly explosive." Tokamak researchers assert that small "tokamak power plants [are] feasible." Indian science is discussed. And a study in Spain finds "antibiotic misuse and potential resistance development."

The New Look

Congratulations! Your new format is logical, user-friendly, and positively enticing. Thanks for accepting the risk such an undertaking always means; the results speak for themselves and are stellar.

Nicholas A. Halasz
University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA. E-mail: nhalasz@ucsd.edu

I love the new Science. The revised indexing with connections to related articles is great, as is the highlighting of special features. Thank you for a thoughtful revamping of an excellent journal.

Pat Mail
Federal Way, WA 98003–7120, USA. E-mail: pmail@sprynet.com

The changes made to the 3 July issue of the print magazine are terrific! It looks great, and it's more readable. A big thumbs up!

Susan Rabitan
E-mail: miigate@molinfo.com

It's really, really nice, the new look.

Janet Rubin
Department of Medicine, Emory University, VAMC-151, Decatur, GA 30033, USA. E-mail: jrubi02@emory.edu

Congratulations on the new look. I appreciate expanded news and opinion categories; more is better. Additionally, plain language usage is a major plus.

Len Stephan
E-mail: lpstep@scn.org

You've really blown it this time. Not only is the new and progressive format a rehash from 1978, but it smacks of cheesiness from the 1950s and 1960s. We have a hard enough time extracting information on a daily basis from the plethora of journals. The last thing we need is for our number-one source of information to be arranged in a different order.

Bret Cooper
Scripps Research Institute, 10550 North Torrey Pines Road, La Jolla, CA 92037, USA. E-mail: bcooper@scripps.edu

Go back to your old format! We are scientists, not mindless "customers" with short attention spans that the marketing people believe the world is made of.

Dominic Eisinger
E-mail: deisinger@cell-science.org

Making the Case for Science

The National Institutes of Health, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, and the Environmental Protection Agency together make up less than 2.5% of the federal budget. How, then, is it possible, as implied in "U.S. R&D budget becomes political football" (News, 3 July, p. 16), that increasing science funding could cause a fiscal train wreck? It is time for science advocates to cease being intimidated by congressional aides—unnamed in the article—who would have us feel guilty about supporting an agenda that is just as important to society as social programs and which surveys have shown to be every bit as popular. Kudos to David Moore and Ralph Yount for refusing to back down.

As House Appropriations Committee Chair Bob Livingston (R–LA) reminded CNN's "Capital Gang" on 18 July, the passage of the big-ticket transportation bill earlier this year has made it evident that Congress will be tapping into budget surplus funds for current appropriations. Tapping the surplus a fraction of a percentage point deeper to enable doubling our investment in another vital infrastructure—science—over the next 5 years is an affordable and politically viable course for Congress to adopt. It is incumbent on the science community to make this case to their elected representatives and fellow citizens without apology and without delay.

Mary Woolley
President, Research!America, 908 King Street, Suite 400E, Alexandria, VA 22314, USA

Dangerous Mixture

A method for the synthesis of diamond by reaction of sodium with carbon tetrachloride was described by Y. Li, Y. Qian, H. Liao, Y. Ding, L. Yang, C. Xu, F. Li, and G. Zhou (Reports, 10 July, p. 246). Readers of this report should be aware that mixtures of sodium and carbon tetrachloride are exceedingly dangerous. After standing for a short period of time, the reaction products are shock-sensitive and highly explosive. Details of this reaction and other references can be found in *Handbook of Reactive Chemical Hazards*, by L. Bretherick (Butterworths, London, ed. 3, 1985) on page 1317. Any mixture of halogenated hydrocarbons and alkali metals should be treated with great caution.

John C. Angus
Chemical Engineering Department, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH 44106–7217, USA. E-mail: jca3@po.cwru.edu

Response

Angus points out that the mixture of CCl_4 and Na is dangerous. We are appreciative of his advice. This information can be found in two handbooks (*1*), that give examples of mixtures in open glassware vessels, where more CCl_4 contacts with Na for a relatively long time.

In our report (*2*), we carried out the reaction at high pressure in an autoclave that can sustain 400 atm. It only takes a few minutes to put CCl_4 and Na into autoclave. We stated, "An appropriate amount of CCl_4 (5 ml) and an excess of metal Na (20 g) were put into a stainless steel autoclave of 50-ml capacity.... The autoclave was maintained at 700°C for 48 hours..." (*2*, p. 246).

As the reaction carried out, the molecular weight of product increased rapidly until an aggregate of C was formed. Excess of Na sped the formation of C. This process did not increase pressure inside the autoclave. As the heat of the reaction was given off, temperature increased quickly. However, the heat capacity of the autoclave (which weights 2.5 kg) moderated this process. Also, CCl_4 has a critical pressure, 45 atm at 283°C (*3*). So in this temperature range, pressure was not unusually high, and C formation slowed the increase of pressure. Then, at some point, the pressure in autoclave began declining.