

Letters

"Yanks" and "Sassenachs"

Emigration has never been officially "encouraged" by the British in Ireland as stated by Aschmann (Letters, 3 Feb.). The purpose of 700 years of British tyranny was not to drive the people out, but rather to keep them in Ireland and, of course, in bondage. Emigration from that country was virtually nonexistent until the famines of 1846–1847, at which time the population of all Ireland was approximately 8 million (it is now 3½ million).

Also, contrary to what Aschmann feels, emigration from Ireland is indeed a blessing in disguise as it exists today. If all of our émigrés were to return from even one of the major overseas Irish "settlements" such as London (which has about ½ million Irish-born or first-generation Irish), it would be disastrous to an economy now smarting from the results of a badly-planned "economic boom" over the past 6 years. Probably the only unfortunate feature of Irish emigration is the brain drain, since a great segment of our professional men do go abroad to escape institutions which have been unchanged since St. Patrick! If these learned people return, they find themselves looked upon as "returned Yanks" or "Sassenachs" (British) and are never really accepted into the fold (or yoke—depending on your point of view) of home-educated and permanently home-based scientists. Such brave men and women generally suffer in silence for a short while and then inevitably return to America, Britain, Australia, or (strangely enough) Africa where their efforts are much more appreciated and rewarded.

Ireland has a very serious brain-drain problem—and the general feeling there is that the return of this segment of our emigrants would, in the long run, be greatly beneficial to the country. They will not, of course, return as long as the attitude towards them—and towards change—which exists in Irish universities remains as it has been since the "drain" started in the 1940's. The return of the skilled and unskilled laborers at this time,

however, would be lethal to our government's plans and projections (whatever they may be) for an "economic resurgence" over the next 10 years! These working-class people send home much more money to their families (and bring it home on vacations) than they ever would have seen had they continued the "wearing of the green" instead of emigrating in the first place.

H. DESMOND BYRNE

Department of Entomology, University of Maryland, College Park 20742

The Pill: Early Breakthroughs

The use of The Pill has become such a commonplace practice among women and its production such an important part of the pharmaceutical industry that it may be of interest to examine the circumstances surrounding the discovery of the physiological mechanisms which are involved. Several endocrinologists with whom I have talked have cited different contributions by different people. I was aware of one early study by Somers Sturgis who wrote the following letter modestly describing his discovery that administered estrogens can suppress ovulation. Was there an earlier first?

S. R. M. REYNOLDS

Department of Anatomy, University of Illinois at the Medical Center,
P. O. Box 6998, Chicago 60680

From 1936–40 I was a surgical assistant attached to Fuller Albright's Ovarian Dysfunction clinic at the Massachusetts General Hospital. Albright was investigating a hormonal cause for severe primary dysmenorrhea. He gave injections of estradiol benzoate every second or third day, starting at mid-cycle, with no response. It was my task to perform biopsies of the endometrium just before menstruation, which were always secretory in this group of patients. He then began his injections earlier—on the 10th day, then the 6th day, and some girls began to report no cramps at all. As I reviewed my biopsies I found an

exciting correlation. The girls who had no cramps showed a proliferative, not a secretory endometrium, and further, they were the only ones receiving estrogen as early as the 6th day. So a secretory endometrium was a necessary factor in dysmenorrhea—had the estrogen merely modified the endometrium?

Kurzrock and Wilson stated in 1938 (1) that ovulation was a *sine qua non* of menstrual cramps. Had the early injections stopped ovulation? How? The clue was in Albright's previous work in assays for pituitary gonadotropin in postmenopausal women. He had shown that high levels of FSH (follicle-stimulating hormone) could be reduced (and hot flashes eliminated) by giving estrogen. That which seems obvious today appeared to me then to be a bright discovery; when we gave estrogen early enough in the menstrual cycle, we had inhibited FSH, so no follicle was stimulated, so none could ovulate, and without ovulation we got proliferative endometrium and no cramps. I announced my discovery to Albright's group, and was chagrined to learn the same answer had come to him the previous week. Thus this "feed-back" hypothesis was arrived at independently and simultaneously, appearing in publication in 1940 (2). At that time it seemed important to us as a way to relieve dysmenorrhea, although we had not fully anticipated the use of this mechanism as practiced today by millions of women to avoid pregnancy by estrogen-induced ovulation inhibition.

SOMERS H. STURGIS

Peter Bent Brigham Hospital,
Boston, Massachusetts 02120

References

1. L. Wilson and R. Kurzrock, *Endocrinol.* **23**, 79 (1938).
2. S. H. Sturgis and F. Albright, "The mechanism of estrin therapy in the relief of dysmenorrhea," *ibid.* **26**, 68 (1940).

In Defense of Jargon

Woffles editorial, "Bad writing" (27 Jan., p. 407) comes at a bad time in my life. I'm just getting used to the sincere ambiguities that underlie much contemporary science writing. Nevertheless, Woffle's urging for improvement has kicked over a hornet's nest in my private garden of complacency. I must rebut.

Woffle is right about abundantly bad science writing but wrong about jargon.

He doesn't seem to grasp its deserved place in the general scheme of things. As an amanuensis-grade technical editor who has jousted with a few outstanding jargoneers during his career, I know that science needs jargon. Without it, everyone—even I—would understand science. This would be calamitous. Consider the consequences if the most elaborate scientific abstractions were perfectly clear to every man, woman, or child. Jargon gives us something to live for, to impress upon our friends and colleagues, and to deploy in undermining our enemies. It enables us to persuade our bosses and peers that we are doing something constructively with our precious time. It gives us a chance to convince our wives and innocent offspring that we have something on the ball even if we can't fix the light switch or mend a broken toy. You gotta have jargon, lots and lots of jargon, because it creates jobs like mine. Edit it out of the scientific paper and you cast serious doubt, to boot, on the author's credibility. Many a scientist's or author's reputation has slipped down the drain because he has stubbornly refused to integrate jargon into his work. . . .

SHELDON J. KARLAN

*Missile and Space Systems Division,
Douglas Aircraft Company, Inc.,
Santa Monica, California*

The editorial of 27 January incorrectly stated that Barbara Tuchman had "quoted the opening passage of a paper presented at the AAAS annual meeting as an example of bad writing." It was not Mrs. Tuchman but Fred Hechinger, the education editor of the New York Times, who quoted that example. He used it in reporting Mrs. Tuchman's address at the meeting of the American Historical Association.—ED.

Again, Classical versus Molecular Biology Studies

I should like to support Branson (Letters, 28 Oct.) in her concern at the prevailing attitude toward the teaching of high school biology as typified by the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study Blue Version. This attitude is expressed by Bonner (Letters, 23 Dec.) who implies that he regards so-called "classical" biology as neither "scientific" nor exciting.

I protest that classical biology has



A SHOT IN THE ARM FOR AMINO ACID ANALYSIS

We have a new instrument and a new method for doing amino acid analyses faster, with better separation and sensitivity.

The instrument: The Hitachi Perkin-Elmer Model KLA-3B Amino Acid Analyzer.

The method: Ligand Metal-Complex Exchange—a unique liquid chromatography system based on columns using highly selective resins.

Two columns are used. One separates alkaline amino acids and the other acidic and neutral components. The number of buffer solutions is reduced, so cost per analysis goes down. You can record the complete range of hydrolyzates including cysteic acid in 105 minutes, with full separation of threonine from serine and tyrosine from phenylalanine.

The KLA-3B is programmed to run com-

pletely unattended. You can analyze 8 or more protein or peptide hydrolyzates per day. Switch to seven different types of columns for all kinds of analyses. Do analytical or preparative work. Analyze free amino acids in blood and other physiological fluids, tissue extracts, food, pharmaceuticals, microbiological preparations and many natural substances.

The instrument offers many fine features. The detector system assures baseline stability. We employ continuous flow pumps to eliminate pulsation. You have the option of adding a low-cost printing integrator with a count rate of 6000 counts per minute to obtain precise quantitative values for small samples. 5X ordinate scale expansion for microsamples is built in.

Price?—\$17,500 and well worth it for an instrument that does the work so automatically and precisely. We'd like to tell you more and send you some sample runs. Write to: Liquid Chromatography Dept., Perkin-Elmer Corporation, 723 Main Avenue, Norwalk, Connecticut 06852.

PERKIN-ELMER