

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Editorial Board

1970

GUSTAF O. ARRHENIUS	RICHARD C. LEWONTIN
FRED R. EGGAN	ALFRED O. C. NIER
HARRY F. HARLOW	FRANK W. PUTNAM
MILTON HARRIS	

1971

THOMAS EISNER	NEAL MILLER
AMITAI ETZIONI	BRUCE MURRAY
EMIL HAURY	JOHN R. PIERCE
DANIEL KOSHLAND, JR.	

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher

DAEL WOLFLE

Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

Assistant Editors: ELLEN E. MURPHY, JOHN E. RINGLE

Assistant to the Editor: NANCY TEIMOURIAN

News Editor: JOHN WALSH

Foreign Editor: DANIEL S. GREENBERG*

News and Comment: LUTHER J. CARTER, PHILIP M. BOFFEY, JOEL R. KRAMER, ANDREW HAMILTON, NANCY GRUCHOW, SCHERRAINE MACK

Research Topics: ROBERT W. HOLCOMB

Book Reviews: SYLVIA EBERHART

Editorial Assistants: JOANNE BELK, ISABELLA BOULDIN, ELEANORE BUTZ, GRAYCE FINGER, NANCY HAMILTON, CORRINE HARRIS, OLIVER HEATWOLE, ANNE HOLDSWORTH, PAULA LECKY, KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, MARGARET LLOYD, VIRGINIA NUSSLE, PATRICIA ROWE, LEAH RYAN, LOIS SCHMITT, BARBARA SHEFFER, RICHARD SOMMER, YA LI SWIGART, ALICE THEILE, MARLENE TUCKER, MARIE WEBNER

* *European Office:* Mulberry Walk, London, S.W.3, England (Telephone: 352-9749)

Advertising Staff

Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager

KAY GOLDSTEIN

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Robert S. Bugbee, 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); MEDFIELD, MASS. 02052: Richard M. Ezequille, 4 Rolling Lane (617-444-1439); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: Herbert L. Burkland, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-DE-7-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772)

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phone: 202-387-7171. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. See also page 7, *Science*, 4 July 1969. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Rm. 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

Population Control, Sterilization, and Ignorance

We recently submitted a questionnaire to students and faculty at Cornell University designed to test attitudes and preferences concerning family size and contraceptive technique. The 1059 respondents (74 percent males) were a mixed lot who represented the physical and biological sciences, humanities, and social sciences and who included faculty (294), graduate students (174), upperclassmen (264), and freshmen (327). Given the level of education of the sample, the results were unexpected in several respects.

First, although there was general agreement (84 percent) on the desirability of limiting family size, a substantial majority (65 percent) said it wanted three children (39 percent) or more (26 percent). Only 30 percent favored two children, and a mere 5 percent expressed preference for one or none. Choice was in no major way affected by age, sex, marital status, parenthood, or professional specialty. Even the respondents whom we expected to be most concerned about the population crisis (for example, graduate students and young faculty in biology) included a minimum of 50 percent with a desire for three children or more.

As regards contraception, about one-half favored "the pill" over all other available means as a way both to space children (53 percent) and to maintain family size at its desired limit (50 percent). Other contraceptive appliances such as condoms, diaphragms, and intrauterine devices were each given top preference by no more than 13 percent of the sample. Voluntary sterilization, either of man or woman, was judged as decidedly undesirable. Only 6 percent opted in favor of vasectomy as the preferred form of contraception once full family size had been achieved; the corresponding number favoring ligation of the oviducts was 2 percent. A majority (52 percent of males and 61 percent of females) said they would *never* undergo sterilization, even after having had the desired number of children. The operation was judged to be as undesirable as abortion and abstinence for prevention of family growth beyond the set limit. It is of interest in this connection that the consequences of sterilization are not generally understood. For example, asked whether vasectomy would abolish the ability to ejaculate, nearly half the respondents (49 percent) confessed to ignorance or expressed either certainty or probability that emission would no longer accompany orgasm. Biology students scored no better than nonbiologists, and graduate students, even after marriage and parenthood, seemed to be no better informed than freshmen. The only exceptional group was the biology faculty, but, even there, 30 percent were either misinformed or uninformed on this point. Comparable ignorance prevails with respect to oviduct ligation: 37 percent of respondents were certain, or thought it probable, that the operation would interfere with the menstrual cycle.

We are bothered by these results. Perhaps of least general concern is the probability that proponents of voluntary sterilization are backing a hopeless or nearly hopeless cause. But what are we to make of the educated youth growing up among us that is either unconcerned about population growth or, at the very least, unable or unwilling to apply to itself the simple arithmetic of compound interest? And what, if any, are the prospects for improved sex education when ignorance about the reproductive system is widespread even among those who should know best?—THOMAS EISNER, ARI VAN TIENHOVEN, FRANK ROSENBLATT, *Cornell University*