

a meteorologist, and an economist); continuation of the space effort (two astronomers, a geologist, a physicist, a chemist, and an economist); the needs for atmospheric research (two aerologists, a meteorologist, a geographer, an agriculturist, a forester, and an economist).

Such reports would have considerable educational value—students might even find them “relevant”—and the studies should become valuable inputs to government from the scientific community. Eventually they might speed up government action to use our advanced technology.

THORNTON PAGE

18639 Point Lookout Drive,
Houston, Texas 77058

Interdisciplinary Science

The general conclusions of Baram's article “Social Control of Science and Technology” (7 May, p. 535) raise in my mind a specter of problems of a greater magnitude than science and society now face. No responsible scientist would disagree that our judicial system has been slow to respond to needed change and that problems relevant to the needs of a complex society are better solved by teams of experts drawn from many fields of endeavor. However, Baram dismisses the current efforts of scientists, and especially biologists, toward these goals, using quotations which are about 180 degrees from most statements I have heard expressed by fellow biologists. Even more surprising is the cursory dismissal of the very real dangers of social control of science and technology as exemplified by Soviet genetics during the Lysenko era.

Baram appears to espouse the oft-heard admonitions of the instant experts of “interdisciplinary” science, who are distrustful of scientific peer groups and perhaps also of man's basically just nature and desire to understand the world he inhabits. I fear that the construction of non-peer, social “do-gooder” agencies specifically given the mission of regulating the range of man's curiosity will do irreparable harm, and may ultimately result in restricting man to the level of the lowest common denominator.

W. S. SILVER

Department of Biology,
University of South Florida,
Tampa 33620

23 JULY 1971

BAUSCH & LOMB 
 ANALYTICAL SYSTEMS DIVISION

The Good Globe Abbe 3-L Refractometer...



Why change a winner? Never just for the sake of a change. But whenever we can add a bit of convenience here, even more durability there—we do make the changes without hesitation.

Everybody knows our Abbe 3-L. It's the easiest refractometer to use—just load, light, and look. The most accurate in its class—reading accuracy of ± 1 in the fourth decimal place. It has a built-in illuminator—requiring no external light source—a compensating prism provides monochromatic Sodium D (5893A) line light. Dual scale calibration—refractive index from 1.30-1.71N_D and percent total solids from 0-85%. One field of view for boundary lines and scales. It has the easiest-on-the-eyes viewing angle. Maintenance is simple—field adjustable, easily replaced prisms, and factory-trained service people throughout the United States and Canada. It's ruggedly built and its reliability is unchallenged.

The latest changes? We've replaced the toggle switch with an easier-to-use push button and added a new epoxy-based texture finish to withstand just about anything you'll ever spill on it. It's the same unbeatable, good old Abbe 3-L—only it gets more unbeatable all the time.



PRECISION REFRACTOMETER
High precision with ability to measure at any wavelength. Overall range: 1.20-1.70N_D. Accuracy to 0.00003N_D.



SERUM PROTEIN METER
Reads total protein in grams/100ml direct to 0.1.



HAND REFRACTOMETER
For rapid determinations of soluble solids, particularly sugar. Low range: 0-60%. High range: 40-85%.



JUICE REFRACTOMETER
Reading accuracy 0.1% by transmitted or reflected light. Range: 0-25% dissolved solids.

For a look at more of our refractometers see above. For more details write for Catalog 33-202, Analytical Systems Division, Bausch & Lomb, 48 Linden Avenue, Rochester, New York 14625.