Food is about. I ask the reader only to examine the evidence and make up his own mind about where the truth lies.

If, as Darby implies, the problem of poisons in foods doesn't exist, perhaps he could answer these questions: Why did the American Meat Institute recently ask Congress for $15 million for government research to find chemicals whose residues in meat would be less toxic. Why has President Eisenhower demanded a review of the entire food-chemicals subject? Why has Representative King of Utah introduced legislation to establish a committee to learn the effects of food chemicals on consumers? Why has Secretary Flemming been ordered to move behind the scenes to avoid any more cranberry or stilbestrol incidents that cause the public to ask embarrassing questions? Why is the Food and Drug Administration so disturbed about pesticide and antibiotic residues in milk?

I defy anyone of sound mind and good conscience to study the voluminous tables of permissible pesticide residues on fruits, vegetables, and meat and then say that a poison-in-foods problem does not exist.

Darby must know that there is a problem and that it is a serious one. It will not be solved, nor will it cease to exist, through being ignored or through attempts to smear and discredit those who attempt to inform the public about the risk it is being subjected to. The problem is only intensified and people become disenchanted when men of influence try to suppress and distort the truth.

WILLIAM F. LONGGOOD
New York, New York

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on Longgood's letter in which he discusses my recent review of his book, *The Poisons in Your Food*. In order to determine whether my "remarks went far beyond the accepted bounds of a review," and to judge Longgood's concern for the recency of the review, I took the occasion to refer to the second edition (1957) of Webster's *New International Dictionary of the English Language*, published by the C. C. Merriam Company. This defines a book review as "a critical account of a book, usually a recent book." I believe the review to which Longgood takes exception fits the definition.

WILLIAM J. DARBY
School of Medicine, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee

It is by no means unusual for Science *to review a book within a month of its publication. Occasionally, in fact, we obtain galley proofs of a book and publish a review at the same time the book is published.*—ED.

Meetings

Preserving Our Science Archives

An important conference on science manuscripts was recently held at the Powell auditorium of the Cosmos Club in Washington, D.C. This 2-day general discussion was made possible by a grant from the National Science Foundation to the History of Science Society. The organizing committee was under the chairmanship of Nathan Reingold of the Library of Congress and included Herman R. Friis of the Society of American Archivists; Philip M. Hamer, National Historical Publications Commission; Robert P. Multhauf, Smithsonian Institution; and André C. Simonpietri, National Research Council. With this broad backing, the growing problem of handling scientific archives is receiving needed attention.

In order to understand adequately the main factor, science, in our current culture, it is necessary that there be appropriate preservation, cataloging, analyzing, and reviewing of original documentary material in all of the sciences. It is becoming more important all the time to learn how our scientific ideas are generated, transmitted, tested, and applied. This information is by no means fully available in formal scientific communications. It is to be found in laboratory daybooks; in personal, organizational, and editorial correspondence; and in notebooks, manuscript drafts, organization reports, personal memoirs and diaries, records of interviews, autobiographical notes, sound recordings, pictures, and movies. This great mine of scientific information is often totally neglected. The material is either cleared out by impatient secretaries or administrators, thrown away by unthinking relatives, or destroyed deliberately by overmodest, disillusioned, or frustrated scientists themselves or, sometimes, by jealous pupils or successors.

Of course, much of this scientific documentary material is not worth saving. The pertinent question—What shall we save in our scientific archives?—was well explored by a panel at the conference. This group included A. Hunter Dupree, University of California (Berkeley); Harry Alpert, University of Oregon; Kendall Birr, State University of New York; Hugh Odishaw, U.S. National Committee for the IGY; Ralph Gabriel, American University; Nathan Reingold, Library of Congress; and Luther Evans, Brookings Institution. In the discussion it was emphasized that selection of material for preservation, for comment, or for publication may contribute to myth-making or orthodoxy but is necessary to avoid being overwhelmed by bulk.

All of the speakers stressed the importance of the informal records of scientists and the need to educate both scientists and university librarians and archivists about the desirability of systematically preserving such records.

The historian and archivist of science must be a discriminating artist as well as a sound judge of what is scientifically significant. The role of the archivist in scientific documentation was discussed in a paper by Wayne C. Grover, Archivist of the United States, which was read by Deputy Archivist R. H. Bahmer. The broad scope of the problem of maintaining science archives was indicated by Henry Guerlac of Cornell University, president of the History of Science Society. Richard Shryock, librarian of the American Philosophical Society, showed the value of such archives for historical as well as scientific purposes.

Case studies of research experience in science achives were reported by Whitfield Bell, associate editor of *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*; by Richard Hewlett, historian of the Atomic Energy Commission; and by Saul Benison of Columbia University. Donald Fleming of Harvard (in a paper read by Henry Guerlac), Karl F. Heumann of the National Research Council, and Oliver W. Holmes of the National Archives discussed proposed research in the problems of science archives and the possible solutions. Bentley Glass of Johns Hopkins University commented on the difficult matter of stimulating individual scientists to take responsibility for the management of their own scientific records and correspondence.

Every scientist has an obligation, as a member of society and as a scientist, to keep accurate records of his scientific work. Such records are usually conveniently kept in his laboratory daybooks. The notebooks may also include abstracts of his reference reading or of conversations, reports, or discussions. These records are supplemented by his correspondence files. All these comprise his personal scientific archives. If the laboratory in which he works is properly managed, this unpublished material becomes part of the laboratory library. As it accumulates it is periodically cataloged, analyzed, and reviewed. What is clearly worthless is discarded, but what appears to have continuing interest is kept. Gradually, what becomes historically significant may be transferred to the library of the institution concerned, whether university, agency, or commercial concern. Some of it may find its way to state historical societies. Wherever it may be deposited, it should be listed in the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections, which is being assembled by the Library of Congress. These scientific records may become the basis, like hospital records, for significant case histories, or, if analyzed and reviewed, for statistical treatment in

estimating trends, procedures, thinking habits, biases, or ingenuity of various scientific groups.

The Conference on Science Manuscripts will try to arrange for some continuing effort to manage our rapidly growing science archives. It may seek the cooperation of the History of Science Society, the American Association for the History of Medicine, the Society of American Archivists, and other interested organizations in holding annual meetings. American scientists are now being reminded of their responsibility to keep in good order their individual scientific records and correspondence. Such record-keeping, in itself, may give the scientist a better understanding of the genesis and growth of his scientific ideas and of the psychological factors involved in reaching those agreements on scientific conclusions which constitute their validity.

CHAUNCEY D. LEAKE
Ohio State University, Columbus

Forthcoming Events

August

14–19. American Pharmaceutical Assoc., Washington, D.C. (R. P. Fischelis, APA, 2215 Constitution Ave., NW, Washington 7)

14–19. International Cong. of Clinical Chemistry, Edinburgh, Scotland. (S. C. Frazer, Clinical Laboratory, Royal Infirmary, Edinburgh)

14–20. Cardiology, 6th Inter-American cong., Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. (H. Alqueres, P.O. Box 1594, Rio de Janeiro)

15–16. National Assoc. of Boards of Pharmacy, Washington, D.C. (P. H. Costello, 77 W. Washington St., Chicago, Ill.)

15–17. Heat Transfer Conf., ASME and AICE, Buffalo, N.Y. (A. B. Conlin, Jr., ASME, 29 W. 39 St., New York 18)

15–17. Organic Scintillation Detectors, intern. conf., Albuquerque, N.M. (G. H. Daub, Chemistry Dept., Univ. of New Mexico, Albuquerque)

15–18. American Veterinary Medicine Assoc., Denver, Colo. (H. E. Kingman, Jr., 600 S. Michigan Ave., Chicago 5)

15–18. Radiation Biology, 3rd Australian conf., Sydney, Australia. (P. Ilbery, Dept. of Preventive Medicine, Univ. of Sydney, New South Wales, Australia)

15–20. International Astronautical Federation, 11th cong., Stockholm, Sweden. (Secretariat, Intern. Astronautical Federation, 12, Bessborough Gardens, London, S.W.1, England)

15–23. Soil Science, 7th intern. cong., Madison, Wis. (R. Bradfield, Dept. of Agronomy, Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y.)

15–24. Crystallography, intern. cong., Cambridge, England. (W. H. Taylor, Cavendish Laboratory, Cambridge, England)

15–25. Chemistry of Natural Products, IUPAC symp., Melbourne, Canberra, and Sydney, Australia. (Convener, Symposium Organizing Committee, Box 4331, G.P.O., Melbourne)

15–25. International Geological Cong., 21st session, Copenhagen, Denmark. (IGC, Mineralogical-Geological Museum, Univ. of Copenhagen, Øster Boldgade 7, Copenhagen K)

15–25. International Paleontological Union, Copenhagen, Denmark. (J. Roger, Service d'Information Geologique, B.R.G.-G.M., 74, rue de la Fédération, Paris 15e, France)

15–25. Sedimentology Cong., 6th intern., Copenhagen, Denmark. [General Secretary, IAS, c/o Institut Français du Petrole, 4, place Bir Hacheim, Rueil-Malmaison (Seine-et-Oise), France]

16–18. Biological Effects of Microwave Radiation, 4th annual conf., New York, N.Y. (M. Eisenbud, New York Univ. Post Graduate Medical School, 550 First Ave., New York 16)

16–19. Society of Automotive Engineers, San Francisco, Calif. (R. W. Crory, SAE, Meetings Operation Dept., 485 Lexington Ave., New York 17)

17–19. Hydraulics Conf., Seattle, Wash. (W. H. Wisely, American Soc. of Civil Engineers, 33 W. 39 St., New York 18)

17–19. University Nuclear Reactors, Gatlinburg, Tenn. (University Relations Div., Oak Ridge Inst. of Nuclear Studies, P.O. Box 117, Oak Ridge, Tenn.)

17–21. Ionization Phenomena in Gases, 4th intern. conf., Uppsala and Stockholm, Sweden. (A. Nilsson, Fysikum, Uppsala)

(See issue of 17 June for comprehensive list)