SCIENCE NEWS®

A Science Service Publication Vol. 109/February 7, 1976/No. 6 Incorporating Science News Letter

OF THE WEEK

Earth's nearest asteroid Leprosy in wild armadillos Quantum pioneer Heisenberg dies Double-negative hydrogen ion Science talent winners 1976 NOVA science series

RESEARCH NOTES

Behavior Biomedicine Science & Society Space Sciences

ARTICLES

Future rail challenges 90 93 Beware the toxic scourge

DEPARTMENTS

Letters

Letters 83
COVER: Britain's Advanced Passenger Train demonstrates how a train of the future can adapt to today's railbeds, with their sharp, ungraded curves—a hydraulic servomechanism tilts the train instead of the track. Engineers at the Railway Technical Center in Derby, England, have some other surprises, too, by which they hope to run 150-mile-an-hour trains on existing track without expensive modification. The aim, besides improving Britain's already excellent passenger service, is to capture part of a growing foreign market for advanced railway systems. The United States could become a major customer if efforts to upgrade America's passenger railways are accelerated. See p. 90. (Photo: British Railway Board)

Publisher Editor

E. G. Sherburne Jr. Kendrick Frazier

Senior Editor and

Dietrick E. Thomsen **Physical Sciences** Senior Editor and

Robert J. Trotter **Behavioral Sciences** Biomedical Sciences Joan Arehart-Treichel Biology/Chemistry Janet L. Hopson Science and Society John H. Douglas **Space Sciences** Jonathan Eberhart

Contributing Editor/ **Mathematics** Lynn Arthur Steen Michelle Galler Riegel Copy Editor **Art Director** Dale Appleman Assistant to the Editor Susan Strasburger Margit Friedrich **Books**

Scherago Associates, Inc. **Advertising** 11 W. 42nd St. New York, N.Y. 10036 Fred W. Dieffenbach Sales Director

Copyright © 1976 by Science Service, Inc., 1719 N St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Republication of any portion of SCIENCE NEWS is prohibited.

Editorial and Business Offices 1719 N Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Subscription Department 231 West Center Street Marion, Ohio 43302

Subscription rate: 1 yr., \$10; 2 yrs., \$18; 3 yrs., \$25. (Add \$2 a year for Canada and Mexico, \$3 for all other countries.) Change of address: Four to six weeks' notice is required. Please state exactly how magazine is to be addressed. Include zip code.

Printed in U.S.A. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C. Title registered as trademark U.S. and Canadian Patent Offices.

Published every Saturday by SCIENCE SERVICE, Inc., 1719 N St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. (202-785-2255). Cable SCIENSERV. Telex 64227.



The nuclear power debate

85

86

86

87

87

88

88

89

89

Your article entitled "The Great Nuclear Power Debate (1)" (SN: 1/17/76, p. 44) fairly portrays both sides. But even the mention of the word terrorism means that we just aren't ready yet for absolutely safe nuclear power. I seriously believe that it is an environmentally and economically safe and justifiable alternative. But, having been a reactor operator for the past three years, I have found that the most frequent question asked is "How can this thing blow up?" The slightest mention of this idea forces me to conclude that the human race is just not responsible enough to warrant the further installation of such potential doomsday machines.

> Ron Pepitone Senior Reactor Operator Reed College Reactor Facility Portland, Ore.

It is outrageous for Mr. Nader and other opponents of nuclear power to imply that Utilities are beginning to realize that nuclear power isn't the blessing it was thought to be," because "within the last two years they have canceled or delayed orders for the equivalent of 130 large nuclear plants." The major reasons for cancellation are the legal entanglements opponents of nuclear power have thrown about any new plant con-struction and activation. The capital required to build a nuclear plant is rather large, and not easily kept together in the face of what are now seen to be inevitable legal delays. Of course, these legal fights, whatever their merit, increase plant construction costs, sometimes to the point where the plant is not economical; but to use that increase in cost as a further argument against nuclear power is both unfair and invalid.

Jerry Pournelle, Ph.D. Studio City, Calif.

In part one of John Douglas's summarized "Great Nuclear Power Debate," the opponent's view is reported as disparaging the solar radiant and wind energy alternative. One particular objection is stated to be cost.

If we wanted to, we could substantially reduce the expense of this alternative by eliminating the need for costly energy transmission networks and local electric utility services via inexpensive integrated solar radiant and wind energy systems designed for the on-site use of collected and converted sun and wind. Further, if said systems were also made sufficiently tall as to avoid being overshadowed in most urban locations, their energy storage requirements could be economically met with compressed air being stored in the hollow support columns of the said structures.

This approach would also assist in encouraging people to forsake much of their car travel for a life in these tall energycollecting structures, within an elevator, walk, bicycle, or trolly ride from their jobs.

Tony Butler II Houston, Tex.

Powers of 10

As Steven W. Siegan indicates in his letter in your Jan. 10 issue, the use of special prefixes for powers of 10 has reached the self-defeating point where it is gratifying only to Latin and Greek scholars and is mainly only an impediment to useful scientific work.

His suggestion to use "p" and "n" is interesting and reminds me of a simplification that I dreamed up shortly after World War II, when I was a civilian physicist at the Taylor Model Basin and have used since for computations with large or small quanti-

12345.0 is written 142345 (or 123245, etc.)

.00012345 is written 1_42345 (or 12_5345 , etc.)

In addition to saving space, this has made slide rule computations considerably simpler, to me, at least.

John d'H. Hord Ft. Walton Beach, Fla.

In a previous letter Steven Siegan suggested a notation to replace prefixes of very large and very small numbers. I would like to point out that his suggestion duplicates in essence notation already in use in computer languages. For example, his 1p17 for the number 1×10^{17} is already written as 1E17 or 1E+17, and his 7n6 for 7×10^{-6} is already written as 7E-6 or 7E-06.

Prefixes for numbers really do not present a problem for nomenclature because most people use the exponential notation in writing anyway. On the other hand, prefixes are useful in conversation, especially among scientists in fields where certain quantities are common and are well understood by those persons present.

Brian H. Nordstrom Lecturer in Chemistry California State University Chico, Calif.

SCIENCE SERVICE

Institution for the Popularization of Science founded 1921; a nonprofit corporation

Institution for the Popularization of Science founded 1921; a nonprofit corporation

Board of Trustees—Nominated by the AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE: Deborah P. Wolfe, Queens College of City University of New York; Bowen C. Dees, The Franklin Institute; Athelstan Spilhaus, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Nominated by the NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES: Gerald F. Tape, Associated Universities; Allen V. Astin, Bethesda, Md.; Glenn T. Seaborg (President), University of California, Berkeley. Nominated by the NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL: Gerald Holton, Harvard University; Joseph W. Berg Jr., National Research Council; Aaron Rosenthal, National Academy of Sciences. Nominated by the JOURNALISTIC PROFESSION: Edward Bilss Jr., American University; Julius Duscha, Washington Journalism Center; O. W. Riegel (Secretary), Washington and Lee University. Nominated by E. W. Scripps Trust: Milton Harris (Treasurer), Washington, D.C.; Edward W. Scripps II (Vice President and Chairman of the Executive Committee), Edward W. Scripps Trust; John Troan, Pittsburgh Press.

Director: E. G. Sherburne Jr.; Assistant Director: Dorothy Schriver; Business Manager: Donald R. Harless; Things of Science: Ruby Yoshioka.

Science News. STOR