

# Letters

## Diesel Emissions

I had no idea that my letter of 2 September would convey the sort of enthusiasm for the diesel engine that it did to Melvin W. First (Letters, 30 Sept., p. 1322). I intended to express only the somewhat wistful hope that Congress would settle the emission-control regulations in such a way, and for a long enough period, that people might feel justified in conducting some development work toward overcoming the stated shortcomings of the diesel. I probably should have made it clearer that I was not proposing we rush into diesels as they stand.

First extrapolates his studies of diesel buses to cover the passenger diesel. However, the passenger diesel, a pre-chamber engine, is much more civilized in its behavior than the open-chamber, commercial engine. Moreover, the latter is commonly subjected to overloading, which I assume is what First means by his reference to "lugging." This is the practice of gaining additional power by injecting more fuel than can be burned cleanly, resulting in the selective burning of hydrogen with large emissions of unburned carbon and rapid sooting of injectors. It results in large increases of all sorts of emissions and is not an option with passenger-car engines.

Concerning  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions, I make no reference to the effects of  $\text{NO}_x$  on air quality and don't "pooh-pooh" anything. What I do say is that, while gasoline engines can be set up for a  $\text{NO}_x$  emission of 0.4 gram per mile, they require a balance of engine variables so precise as to be precarious and unlikely to survive under prevalent conditions of maintenance.

It is easy to dispose of the problem by stating, as First does, that all we need to do is to inspect cars for engine variables and emissions the way we now do for safety equipment, but this is, in fact, extremely difficult. Safety-equipment inspections are superficial, visual once-overs, while inspection for engine variables and emissions requires time, trained personnel, and expensive, sophisticated equipment. We cannot suppose that by simple edict we can accomplish the upgrading and expansion of the automobile maintenance and repair industry—one of the largest and most dispersed of our industries—and then put in

place the enormous federal establishment needed to supervise and enforce it all, especially in view of the fact that it has not been found economically or politically possible to take any action to reduce the largest mobile source of pollution—the past-model cars.

Since I've been convicted of posing value judgments anyway, let me say that, if I had my choice between a fairly certain 1.5 grams of  $\text{NO}_x$  per mile and 0.4 gram per mile under the conditions of that sort of regulation, I would go with the nitrogen oxides.

FREDRICK J. HOOVEN

*Thayer School of Engineering,  
Dartmouth College,  
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755*

## Medical Schools' Problems

I concur with Philip H. Abelson's editorial, "Coercion of medical schools" (16 Sept., p. 1137). Few, if any, medical schools are willing to have students directly "assigned" or "matched" to them by any outside agency or individual. This is not only a problem for the medical schools but brings up the much larger issue of defining the government's appropriate role in relation to the university. I hope our colleagues in the general public and scientific community will convey to their "representatives" their opinions on this key issue.

It is important to note that passing the first part of the national medical board exam cannot be equated with the successful completion of a quality controlled, integrated medical curriculum with periodic appropriate assessment. Scores on this exam are used by most medical schools as an external parameter to assess performance in addition to their own internal evaluation and standards.

The legal morass surrounding the regular admission process has led most medical schools to state that the applicant was qualified, but that the competition was such that they were unable to offer a position. In an effort to be humane and avoid litigation, medical schools have fostered a partial myth that there are large numbers of qualified students who must seek their education abroad.

Finally, it is of interest to note that, in 1975, 69 percent of the U.S. citizens

seeking to transfer from foreign to U.S. medical schools through COTRANS (the Coordinated Transfer Application System) were from three states: New York (41 percent), New Jersey (14 percent), and California (9 percent) (1). At the risk of sounding extremely provincial, it seems that the citizens of many states may be footing the expensive bill of educating the medical students of a few other states.

THERON A. EBEL

*Medical Center, University of  
South Florida, Tampa 33612*

## References

1. W. F. Dube, *Characteristics of U.S. Citizens Seeking Transfer from Foreign to U.S. Medical Schools in 1975 via COTRANS* (Association of American Medical Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1977), p. xi; available from ERIC Reproduction Service, Arlington, Va.

## "Watchdog" of the Government?

Since 1945, the frontiers of scientific research have been expanding at a greater pace than at any other period in history. Most of the growth in this country has resulted from increased financial support by the U.S. government, which has become the chief patron of modern scientific research. By this means, the government has been able to profoundly influence the course of scientific research in both the public sector (for example, the National Institutes of Health) and the private sector (for example, the academic community).

The present situation, in which scientists in the private sector depend upon government sources for financial support of their research and, in many instances, their livelihoods as well, is obviously an unhealthy one. In particular, the autonomy of the university, historically and necessarily one of the most independent institutions in our society, is gradually being eroded. It is unreasonable to expect researchers to be critical of the government's specific research programs and allocations; a clear conflict of interest thus exists. Yet, there is an equally clear need for a review of and, if warranted, a criticism of both government research allocations and programs that result from such allocations. Obviously, such a review would best be done by an organization that is financially independent of the government, staffed by scientists, and with innovative, imaginative leadership that is able to both evaluate existing government programs and develop plans for and recommend the initiation of new ones.

Organizations such as the Brookings

Institution periodically review government economic policy. A similar independent institute should be established to serve as a "watchdog" of the government's projects and programs affecting the national scientific and health research effort.

DAVID E. LILIENFELD  
Johns Hopkins University,  
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

ABRAHAM M. LILIENFELD  
School of Hygiene and Public Health,  
Johns Hopkins University,  
Baltimore, Maryland 21205

### Concerning Y. Orlov and A. Sharansky

The following letter to A. P. Alexandrov, president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, was signed by us and 145 of our colleagues. It concerns physicist Yuri Orlov and mathematician Anatoly Sharansky. Both are being held in Lefortovo Prison in Moscow. Orlov is charged with making anti-Soviet statements regarding the implementation of the Helsinki agreement. Sharansky has been held incommunicado without charge for more than 7 months following his application to emigrate. It is thought that he is to be charged with treason.

The undersigned, writing as individual scientists and engineers, wish to express our concern about the situations of physicist Yuri Orlov and mathematician Anatoly Sharansky. We assign great importance to the benefits of scientific and technological cooperation between the citizens of our two countries. We share with our colleagues in the Soviet Union the hope that our growing international fraternity will serve as a powerful force for peace and friendship in the world. However, the present situation of Orlov and Sharansky suggests a regression to the conditions of twenty-five years ago, which will inevitably create major new barriers to the cooperation which we have achieved since those times. The implementation of the Helsinki agreement will be hindered severely by the legal accusations being made against two Soviet scientists who question the effectiveness of that implementation. In particular, the charge of treason against Sharansky will have a chilling effect on future international cooperation between scientists and engineers. We respectfully request that you use your good offices with the judicial authorities to obtain the dismissal of charges against Orlov and Sharansky.

For identification, the undersigned are scientists and engineers at Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois.

LLOYD G. HYMAN  
JOSEPH J. KATZ, TIMOTHY O'CONNOR  
MURRAY PESHKIN, G. ROY RINGO  
Argonne National Laboratory,  
Argonne, Illinois 60439

### Cancer Congress in Argentina

A group of scientists and physicians, deeply concerned about reports of political repression, torture, and executions in Argentina and about the implications of participating in the 12th International Cancer Congress in Buenos Aires, have drafted the following statement:

The undersigned physicians and scientists engaged in cancer research and patient care are deeply concerned by the flagrant abrogation of human rights in Argentina, the country in which the 12th International Cancer Congress is scheduled to be held on October 5-12, 1978 at Buenos Aires. Recent reports [Nicholas Wade, *Science* **194**, 1397 (1976): "Repression in Argentina: Scientists caught up in tide of terror"] leave little doubt that scientists, physicians, professors, journalists, intellectuals, and other citizens have been arrested, imprisoned without benefit of habeas corpus, often tortured, and sometimes executed without trial. We cannot in good conscience condone such actions, nor can we participate in an International Cancer Congress however worthy its cause, if it is held in Argentina. To prevent the adverse impact which such a boycott might well have on the international effort against cancer, we call upon the officers of the International Union Against Cancer (UICC) to convene in emergency session for the purpose of considering an alternate venue for the 12th International Cancer Congress in 1978.

We invite U.S. scientists and physicians who share these views to join us in signing this petition. Copies will be made available on request to Dr. Henry Rappaport, City of Hope National Medical Center, 1500 East Duarte Road, Duarte, California 91010.

We understand that similar actions are now under way in Canada and France. We hope that colleagues in all the countries which are signatories of the Helsinki declaration of human rights will join in this protest.

DAVID BALTIMORE  
Center for Cancer Research,  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology,  
Cambridge 02139

EMIL FREI III  
Sidney Farber Cancer Institute,  
44 Binney Street,  
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

HENRY S. KAPLAN  
Department of Radiology,  
Cancer Biology Research Laboratory,  
Stanford University Medical Center,  
Stanford, California 94305

HENRY RAPPAPORT  
City of Hope National Medical Center,  
Duarte, California 91010

HOWARD M. TEMIN  
McArdle Memorial Laboratory for  
Cancer Research, University of  
Wisconsin Medical Center,  
Madison 53106



**DNA,  
Membrane  
Filters,  
and the  
99% Solution.**

The problem is to get an accurate measurement of radioactivity in a sample when it's on a membrane filter. Even when the filter is solubilized in BRAY'S solution, for example, the cpm may very poorly indicate the actual recovery in dpm.

Our Applications Laboratory compared various methods of counting equivalent amounts of tritiated DNA on membrane filters and found dramatic differences in recovery. One method yielded a recovery of 99% using our AQUASOL-2\* Universal Cocktail. Comparative data are contained in Applications Note #19A, by Dr. Yutaka Kobayashi and Dr. Wayne Harris. Let us send it to you.

\*Trademark

**NEN New England Nuclear**  
549 Albany Street, Boston, Mass. 02118  
Customer Service 617-482-9595

**NEN Chemicals GmbH**: D-6072 Dreieich, W. Germany.  
Daimlerstrasse 23, Postfach 401240,  
Telephone: (06103) 85034, Telex: 4-17993 NEN D

**NEN Canada Ltd.**, 2453 46th Avenue, Lachine, Que. H8T 3C9,  
Telephone: 514-636-4971, Telex: 05-821808

Circle No. 175 on Readers' Service Card