

Nuclear Medicine and Nuclear War

TO THE EDITOR: Dr. Stanley J. Goldsmith's Newsline Commentary "Nuclear Medicine and Nuclear War" in (*J Nucl Med* 26:841, 1985) draws attention to the message put forward by United States Secretary of State George P. Shultz. In Mr. Shultz's words: "Scientists have no business in voicing professional opinions on matters concerning nuclear weapons and defense policy."

The Danish Society for Clinical Physiology and Nuclear Medicine strongly supports the protest expressed by Dr. Goldsmith. We also agree that nuclear medicine professionals and scientists have a special obligation to analyze and discuss the effects of nuclear arms. Nuclear war and defense policy seems to be the most important issue of the 1980s—our silence would be completely unacceptable in any democracy.

Harriet Dige-Petersen
*Danish Society
for Clinical Physiology
and Nuclear Medicine
Copenhagen, Denmark*

Early Friends of Nuclear Magnetic Resonance

TO THE EDITOR: Dr. MacIntyre's Editorial in *J Nucl Med* 26:958-960, 1985 informs the reader that Dr. Leon Kaufman's symposium at the 29th Annual Meeting of The Society of Nuclear Medicine in June, 1982, was "One of the first symposia on the application of nuclear magnetic resonance to medicine" (1).

However, Leon's Continuing Education session was held 3 years after the formal nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) conference, Diagnostic Applications of Nuclear Magnetic Resonance, presented at the 26th Annual Meeting of The Society in June, 1979. This program was funded by the Veterans Administration. It was organized and chaired by me. Another early instance of nuclear medicine scientist interest in NMR was the full day conference I organized in Washington, DC, September 14, 1979. This, too, was funded by the Veterans Administration.

It is testimony to the prescience of the Veterans Administration and The Society of Nuclear Medicine that they recog-

nized the significance of NMR in its beginnings. It would be a distinct disservice to the archives of Nuclear Medicine were the Journal to fail to record the very early involvement of the specialty of Nuclear Medicine with NMR in 1979. Needless to say, none of the above chronology has any bearing on the high regard I have for my good friend, Dr. Leon Kaufman: his matchless pioneering work in NMR cannot be overemphasized.

James J. Smith
*Veterans Administration
Washington, DC*

References

1. MacIntyre WJ: The relationship of nuclear magnetic resonance to nuclear medicine: Friend or foe? *J Nucl Med* 26:958-960, 1985

REPLY: I would like to thank Dr. Smith for pointing out even earlier examples than I had used to show the interest and support of The Society of Nuclear Medicine and the nuclear medicine field for the potential of nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR).

In 1979, there were few, if any, clinical results to be shown, so that the support of an NMR conference at that time does, indeed, show the wisdom and foresight of the organizers.

William J. MacIntyre
*Cleveland Clinic Foundation
Cleveland, Ohio*

Correction

A typographical error appeared in a recent article by M. H. Malik, "Simultaneous Dual Isotope Studies in the Diagnosis of Infection," *J. Nucl Med* 26:722-725, 1985. The calculation for the negative predictive value should have been 24/25 (96%) instead of 24/26 (96%).