

correspondence

Fusion first for USSR

SIR,—A short report was published (*Nature* 269, 370; 1977) concerning the "generation of neutrons by thermonuclear fusion using a concentric explosion with an exceptionally high degree of symmetry". The results were obtained by the Polish group headed by Professor S. Kaliski and were announced at an international conference in Prague.

Similar results obtained in the Soviet Union were made public in 1958 by L. A. Artsymovich at the Second International Conference of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy held in Geneva. (L. A. Artsymovich, *Controlled fusion research in the USSR; Proceedings of the Second United Nations International Conference of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy*, 2298, 31, 1958).

As early as 1955, 10^8 neutrons per impulse were generated in our experiments (which were mentioned by L. A. Artsymovich) by focusing converging spherical shock waves on a UD_2T target. In 1963 for UD_3 and gaseous D_2 targets this number was increased to 3×10^{11} . The converging shock wave was formed by implosion of a spherical charge of explosive. In most of the experiments the external diameter of the design was about 70 cm, the mass of gaseous D_2 being about 3×10^{-4} g.

Yours faithfully,
A. S. KOZYREV
V. A. ALEKSANDROV
N. A. POPOV

Leningrad, USSR

Correspondence and papers of Michael Polanyi

SIR,—A major part of Michael Polanyi's papers is now in the Joseph Regenstein Library at the University of Chicago. These are the papers that were in his possession in Oxford, but no systematic effort has been made so far to collect correspondence, manuscripts and memorabilia from people with whom he was in touch. The question as to how to collect this material comes at a time when a biography is being undertaken by Professor W. T. Scott of the University of Nevada in Reno. In the effort to combine the advantages of having original documents available for scholarly use at a centre in Britain, with access to the material by the biographer, and ultimate deposit of copies in the Chicago archive, we wish to make the following request.

We ask anyone possessing such material to make copies, and to send the originals to Miss Cicely Argyle, 12 Sunderland Avenue, Oxford. She will acknowledge receipt, and will deliver the material to the Contemporary Scientific Archives Centre in Oxford. This centre, under the direction of Professor Margaret Gowing, will process and catalogue the material and deliver it for permanent deposit to the Bodleian Library.

The making of copies before entrusting documents to the post is clearly important.

The biographer would appreciate having these copies sent to him, and undertakes to see that when he has made use of them they will finally be sent to the archive in Chicago to fill out that collection. He would also appreciate receiving any recollections and memorabilia, as well as suggestions of other sources of material. His address is: Professor W. T. Scott, Dept. of Physics, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada 89557 U.S.A.

Yours faithfully,
G. N. BURKHARDT
W. MANSFIELD COOPER
ALISTER HARDY
ROBIN HODGKIN
ARTHUR KOESTLER
DRUSILLA SCOTT
TODD
T. F. TORRANCE
VERONICA WEDGWOOD

Effective trypanocides

SIR,—I was astonished to read the statement by your contributor Hugo Van den Bossche in his article 'Chemotherapy of parasitic infections', (22 June, page 626) that Berenil "is at present the only effective trypanocide left for use in cattle".

The reference given for this information is 'Williamson J., *Trop. Dis. Bull.* 73, 531-542 (1976)'. It is most unfortunate that an erroneous statement such as this should be perpetuated and re-published.

The facts are that several other products are available for the control of bovine trypanosomiasis, including 'Samorin' and 'Novidium' (May & Baker Ltd.), 'Ethidium' and 'Prothidium' (The Boots Co. Ltd.), 'Trypamidium' (S.P.E.C.I.A.) and 'Antrycide' (I.C.I. Ltd.).

Yours faithfully,
J. P. CAVILL

May & Baker Ltd,
Upminster, Essex, UK

Credibility of the anti-nuclear lobby

SIR,—I hope I am not too late to comment on Professor Pearce's thought-provoking contribution to the nuclear debate (20th July, p260).

●A "selective, admonishing and often haughty style" is surely more characteristic of the "anti-nuclear lobby" than of Mr Justice Parker.

●Difficult though Professor Pearce finds it to see how "any sane mortal would perpetrate false claims so as to foist an unsafe industry on an unsuspecting public", this appears to be exactly the opinion of many of the nuclear industry's critics. I also rather suspect that his remark about "the desire to be right and toe the party line" again describes an attitude more characteristic of the critics than of the industry.

●I doubt if anyone would argue that the nuclear power industry never makes

mistakes. But I would like to advance the apparently outlandish idea that the anti-nuclear lobby can make mistakes too.

●Professor Pearce's point about a possible change in the make-up of society invalidating the case for nuclear power is weak on two levels. First, what would we think of an administration which declined to build public housing, schools or hospitals, or even to reform itself, on the grounds that presently prevailing values cannot be assumed to be those of the future? Second, even if society changes world-wide in the direction the critics wish, there will still be a demand (albeit reduced) for central power stations. Is there not then a case for building nuclear plant, and allowing the dearer, dirtier and more dangerous coal and oil burners to be phased out? To forestall a possible objection, I fully agree that a community limited to near the surface of one planet cannot continue to grow indefinitely. But why the optimum level of economic activity should be just that of the developed world in 1978 has never been explained, to my satisfaction at least.

●It is certainly proper to put a case against nuclear power. But the advocates of this case are surely honour bound (as I think Professor Pearce would agree) both to examine this case themselves, and to permit others to do so. It is my distinct impression that many of the present 'antis' do neither now, and would do neither in the future in Professor Pearce's "institutions to debate and evaluate those alternatives".

●While not all the opposition to nuclear power is irrational, a great deal of it certainly is, and it is surely unfair to castigate as "hysterical outbursts" any statement to this effect.

●In the face of some of the arguments put to him, is it not understandable that Mr Justice Parker should occasionally be "perplexed and confused"? For example, reportedly one suggestion was that future energy needs should be met with "cosmic forces". This sort of talk perplexes and confuses even me, and if that makes me a haughty and unfeeling rationalist, so be it.

●Whether the debate becomes a conflict is surely in the hands of the critics as much as of the industry. The death of a demonstrator at Creys Malville in France makes this point sadly dramatic. A recent article in *New Scientist* (3 August, p349) is distinctly ominous, and I for one would welcome Professor Pearce's comments on the kind of tactics hinted at therein.

Lastly because of the tone of the "debate", I had better state that I am a physicist with no professional connection to the nuclear industry. I also hold that complete lack of bias, like perfect social justice, is an unattainable ideal. But, again like social justice, it is very much worth-while to work towards it.

Yours faithfully,
J. F. CRAWFORD

Klein Dottingen
Switzerland