ately seek causes. If the meeting place of a society becomes determined by political considerations there will be no end of trouble. Don't meet in San Francisco—they are unsympathetic on campus to minority groups. Don't meet in Youngstown—they are unsympathetic toward paying taxes for public education. Don't meet in Boston—they are unsympathetic toward distributing information on contraceptives. Nuts!

For several years I have been working closely with a group of Chicago scientists planning a small meeting of paleontologists for 5–7 September 1969. We have never discussed the politics of the city. However, a number of the Chicago scientists are annoyed at the boycott of their city. Certainly their civil rights should be protected. Not only are local scientists in any city which is boycotted punished for the sins of others, but the boycott does little except insure economic difficulties for lower socioeconomic groups. Moral principles and practical results need not go hand in hand, but before we scientists start throwing our economic muscle around, we should make sure we have some.

Finally, I am annoyed with the liberals who view the Chicago disorders as the worst thing that ever happened. I was in Prague watching a first step toward democracy go down the drain, so I cannot judge how serious an event it really was. Although it was a stain on our country, at least the Chicago trouble could be seen live on television and was freely reported without anyone being shot with a 50-caliber tank-mounted machine gun.

I think it is time to drop all talk of a Chicago boycott. As scientists we should strive to understand what happened in the hope that it may be avoided in the future. However, nowhere in the scientific ethic do I see any rationale for vindictiveness.

ELLIS L. YOCHELSON
12303 Stafford Lane,
Bowie, Maryland 20715

Fewer Pesticides—More Control

Carter's excellent article on the Madison DDT hearings (7 Feb., p. 548) was especially interesting to me, since I was the entomologist who testified in behalf of the Environmental Defense Fund. Recently, as a member of a research team concerned with cotton pest control, I strongly advocated the use of DDT over alternative materials, because of its less severe impact on the agroecosystem. The advocacy of DDT earned me a somewhat heretical reputation among my colleagues, in the light of my long experience as a specialist in biological control!

Actually, I realize that nature's way does not always work, and that chemical pest control is frequently necessary for economical crop production. I believed that DDT was the ecologically safer chemical choice in cotton. But what I learned at the Rochester conference (*1*) came as a shock and convinced me that the use of DDT and certain other organochlorines should be curtailed and eventually stopped. This change of opinion was an important facet of my testimony at Madison.

The chemical alternatives to DDT are disturbing, but until better things come along, these appear to be the safer materials. As for a moratorium on the use of DDT, it will be interesting to see how the agricultural economy of Arizona and the health and welfare of its citizenry hold up under the recently invoked year-long ban on DDT there. The ban is no assurance that all is well with chemical pest control in Arizona. Indeed, if the situation is at all comparable to that in California, it probably borders on the chaotic. But at least Arizona has stopped pouring DDT into the biosphere and is merely tearing up its own environment with alternative materials.

In general, the synthetic organic insecticides are ecologically crude and engender serious problems: resurgence of target pests, outbreaks of nontarget species, and pest resistance to pesticides. These have contributed to a steady increase in the use of insecticides in recent years. For example, in California pest control costs for two of its major crops, citrus and cotton, have risen sharply over the past decade. A critical analysis nationwide would reveal a similar pattern: bollworms in Texas cotton, spider mites in deciduous fruit orchards, cabbage loopers in vegetable crops, and so forth.

For the past two decades, the pest control field has been dominated by toxicologists and chemical company sales personnel—persons often either ignorant of or indifferent to ecological principles. Fortunately, entomologists are beginning to appreciate the ecological pitfalls that attend the unilateral use of synthetic insecticides. The concept of integrated control is gaining acceptance (*2*). This concept recognizes the ecological nature of pest control and has as its objective pest population management rather than simple pest kill. Integrated control does not reject chemical insecticides but attempts, instead, to integrate them into pest management systems. Its advocates are not "anti-insecticide," but they do reject ecologically untenable materials and practices, and they plead for more sophisticated materials and a voice in their development. . . . Greater pesticide efficacy and reduced environmental pollution will result. . . .

ROBERT VAN DEN BOSCH
Division of Biological Control,
University of California,
1050 San Pablo Avenue, Albany 94706

References

1. First Rochester Conference on Toxicity, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York, 4–6 June 1968.
2. R. F. Smith and H. T. Reynolds, *Proc. Food Agr. Organ. Symp. Integrated Control* **1**, 11 (1966).

Smithsonian's Albatross

No man can be so naive as to think that a classified project financed by the army and administered through Fort Detrick has been funded by its backers in the name of pure research ("Biological warfare: Is the Smithsonian really a 'cover'?" 21 Feb., p. 791). Granting this premise, the defense offered by supporters of the Smithsonian's Pacific Biological Survey—that the military did not inform participants of its ulterior motives—misses the point completely. Few of us, I think, would willingly work on secret CBW projects. What is most inimical to our integrity and disappointing to our students is not the overt work of this few but the priorities of a majority. Our professionalism has distorted the ranking of our values; we have so inflated the importance of our research that we silently accept heavy strings on doubtful money to pursue work that would otherwise not be funded. We commit, in other words, the classic sin of pride.

. . . I appreciate Ripley's assessment of the Pacific project as "wonderful . . . from the scientific point of view—the fulfillment of a dream," but ask only that we be willing to defer dreams to save not only our honor, but perhaps even our lives and fortunes as well.

STEPHEN JAY GOULD
Museum of Comparative Zoology,
Harvard University, Cambridge,
Massachusetts 02138