

science," Greenberg is saying, must learn to adjust itself, in some measure and certainly not without limit, to these other social values and ideologies. If it does, it will be better able to realize its own values in the greatest possible measure. And if it does not, it runs the danger of being at least temporarily brushed aside by other overstated values. Science in general and *Science* in particular are much in debt to Greenberg for his news reports, and now for this book. I hope McClure's resistance is not widespread in the community of science.

BERNARD BARBER

*Department of Sociology,
Barnard College,
Columbia University, New York 10027*

Irradiated Foods Warning

The action of the Food and Drug Administration in withholding approval from irradiated foods in programs of the Atomic Energy Commission and the U.S. Army is reasonable and should be welcomed by consumers and toxicologists (12 July, p. 146). Irradiation of organic materials induces formation of poorly characterized radiomimetic compounds, including epoxides, lactones, quinones, peroxides, and hydroxyalkylperoxides (1). Such compounds are carcinogenic and mutagenic (2). So-called, lifelong feeding studies with irradiated foods, commencing conventionally in adult life, may not be sensitive enough to reveal low carcinogenic hazards. Yet, as can be seen in a recent bibliography on "Wholesomeness of irradiated foods" (3) and elsewhere, there are no published data on actual lifelong feeding studies, commencing in infancy, with extracts of irradiated foods, nor are there any data on mutagenicity tests in mammals, with either irradiated whole foods or extracts. In these circumstances, the FDA does well in reconsidering the already approved petition for bacon.

SAMUEL S. EPSTEIN

*Laboratories of Environmental
Toxicology and Carcinogenesis,
Children's Cancer Research
Foundation, Boston, Massachusetts*

References

1. F. C. Steward, R. D. Holsten, M. Sugii, *Nature* **213**, 178 (1967); P. R. Hills and R. J. Berry, *ibid.* **215**, 309 (1967); J. Schubert, J. A. Watson, E. R. White, *Int. J. Radiat. Biol.* **13**, 222 (1967).
2. L. H. Gray, H. B. Chase, E. E. Deschner, J. W. Hunt, O. C. A. Scott, *Int. Conf. Peaceful*

- Uses At. Energy* **22**, 413 (1958); P. Kotin and H. L. Falk, *Rad. Res. Suppl.* **3**, 193 (1963); B. L. Van Duuren, L. Orris, N. Nelson, *J. Nat. Cancer Inst.* **35**, 707 (1965).
3. E. F. Reber, K. Raheja, D. Davis, *Fed. Proc.* **25**, 1530 (1966).

Investment of Public Funds: What Are the Returns?

I have read with interest and concern the Harris-Wolfle editorial "The paradox of science in the universities" (19 July, p. 223). My concern is best illustrated by two consecutive sentences.

We recognize its [science's] contributions to economic growth, national security, health, and general well-being. At the same time, we are bombarded with questions and statements such as: "Is science misshaping the world?" "There is danger in growing technology." "Science, the pursuit of truth, is in trouble."

Frankly, those are not the questions or statements I hear most frequently, except, perhaps, for the last one. Rather, I hear asked over and over again, "What have we got for our enormous investment of public funds in science over the past 15 years?" It's a simple, and perhaps simple-minded, question, but until the science community either tries to answer it or demonstrates why it cannot be answered, science, the pursuit of truth, will continue to be in trouble. In the face of overwhelming demands on public funds occasioned by our domestic and overseas problems, a mere assertion, with no attempt at documentation, that "we," the scientists, "recognize its contributions to economic growth, national security, health, and general well-being" is likely to be unheard.

Congressmen are laymen who are charged with the heavy responsibility of determining national priorities. Every 2 (or 6) years they have to convince other laymen, their constituents, that they have discharged that responsibility wisely. If science is to receive a larger share of limited federal resources, our legislators need help in understanding, and then explaining, what has been and can be achieved through such an investment. I sense little distrust in Congress of the dangers of technology. But I sense declining conviction that science, as it is now constituted, can provide solutions to our problems. As a nonscientist I am convinced that, somehow, science can make a better case for itself.

JOHN F. MORSE

*American Council on Education,
1785 Massachusetts Avenue, NW,
Washington, D.C. 20036*



Why (Almost) Everybody Re-Orders L / I REPIPETS and Dilutors

93% of all chemists who buy L/I instruments re-order within 90 days! Here's why: 1. Precision—1% accuracy; 0.1% reproducibility. 2. Time saved—pipeting and diluting time is cut by 50% to 90% for all research analyses. 3. Safety—REPIPETS and Dilutors fit directly on your reagent containers, completely eliminating the hazards of mouth pipeting and the dangerous transfer of reagents. 4. No clean-up—the instruments are self-cleaning. 5. You can handle any liquid—acids, concentrated alkalies, volatile solvents, chlorinated hydrocarbons, etc. 6. No cross-contamination. 7. Air filters keep reagents pure. 8. Complete selection—REPIPETS and Dilutors are supplied in 1, 5, 10, 20, and 50 ml sizes. REPIPETS \$47.50, Automatic Dilutors \$89.50. For 4-minute water determinations in the range 1 ppm to 100% water, use Labindustries Aquametry apparatus. \$295, including reagent. Join the 93% Club! Please write for more information.

LABINDUSTRIES

1802 H Second St.
Berkeley, Calif. 94710
Phone (415) 843-0220

Circle No. 88 on Readers' Service Card