SCIENCE

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

1972

ALFRED BROWN
JAMES F. CROW
THOMAS KUHN
ELLIOTT W. MONTROLL

FRANK PRESS FRANK W. PUTNAM WALTER O. ROBERTS

1973

H. S. GUTOWSKY
ARTHUR D. HASLER
RUDOLF KOMPFNER
DANIEL E. KOSHLAND, JR.

GARDNER LINDZEY RAYMOND H. THOMPSON EDWARD O. WILSON

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher William Bevan Business Manager HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

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

Assistant to the Editor: NANCY TEIMOURIAN

News and Comment: John Walsh, Deborah Shapley, Robert Gillette, Nicholas Wade, Constance Holden, Scherraine Mack

 $\begin{array}{lll} \textit{Research} & \textit{News} \colon \text{ Allen } L. & \textit{Hammond, William } \\ \textbf{D. Metz} & \end{array}$

Book Reviews: Sylvia Eberhart, Katherine Livingston, Kathryn Mouton

Cover Editor: GRAYCE FINGER

Editorial Assistants: Margaret Allen, Isabella Bouldin, Blair Burns, Eleanore Butz, Ronna Cline, Annette Diamante, Mary Dorfman, Judith Givelber, Marlene Glaser, Corrine Harris, Oliver Heatwole, Christine Karlik, Marshall Kathan, Margaret Lloyd, Jane Minor, Daniel Rabovsky, Patricia Rowe, Leah Ryan, Lois Schmitt, Richard Sommer, Ya Li Swigart, Alice Theile

Membership Recruitment: LEONARD WRAY; Subscriptions: BETTE SEEMUND; Addressing: THOMAS BAZAN

Advertising Staff

Director EARL J. SCHERAGO Production Manager BONNIE SEMEL

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Sales: New York, N.Y. 10036: Herbert L. Burklund, 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858); Scotch Plans, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); Medfield, Mass. 02052: Richard M. Ezequelle, 4 Rolling Lane (617-444-1439); Chicago, Ill. 60611: John P. Cahill, 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. Phones: (Area code 202) Central office: 467-4350; Book Reviews: 467-4367; Business Office: 467-4411; Circulation: 467-4417; Guide to Scientific Instruments: 467-4480; News and Comment: 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions: 467-4483; Research News: 467-4321, Reviewing: 467-4440. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. See also page xy, Science, 24 September 1971. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Room 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

Community Health

The assumption that effective treatment of illness vastly improves community health is incorrect. Prolongation of life often adds to the total burden of illness in the community, and therapeutic successes sometimes increase the proportion of defective genes in the community genetic pool. Even discounting these special circumstances, medical care from a community health viewpoint always comes too late. In 1920, Andrija Stampar, the great public health leader of Yugoslavia, wrote:

No matter what the number of physicians may be, they will never improve people's health by individual therapy. . . . The successes of practical medicine are no doubt remarkable and the help offered by it . . . important, but always for a small number of people only. . . . People's health is never in direct relation to the number of physicians.

This is not an attempt to derogate the importance of medical care; however, community health is more directly a function of disease prevention than of the availability and sophistication of our resources for medical care.

Most of the decline in disease incidence and mortality, and therefore most of the increase in average life expectancy, has resulted from influences other than efforts aimed at controlling specific diseases. It is true that certain successes of preventive medicine are unambiguous. However, despite successes based upon the great expansion of knowledge of the specific etiologic agents of disease, the major benefits that have accrued to us in the past 100 years have resulted from the operation of undirected, nonspecific influences. Advances in medical knowledge and the decline of disease are simultaneous results of a general improvement in the quality of life.

The preceding discussion leads quite naturally to the conclusion that enormous improvements would be possible if we were able to understand and control the general environmental factors contributing to disease. Past scientific advances have been based very solidly on Aristotelian logic and reductionist philosophy. The successes attending this approach have been strong, and I would not be so foolish as to argue with success. However, I will argue that our obsession with reductionism has led us to ignore the very real values of a synthetic systemsoriented approach. To define, explain, and gain control of the various and extremely effective determinants of disease requires a deep appreciation of the ecological systems of which they are a part. Environmental management based on this kind of ecological research holds forth the promise of new and more effective means of disease prevention.

We can establish, despite the complicating factor of genetic variability, a working hypothesis that the differences in disease frequency between different populations is mainly a result of their different environmental experience. Therefore, the lowest observed risk of illness in any general population is a goal attainable in any other population. This falls somewhat short of the ideal of eradicating disease, but it is so far in advance of present reality that it should be acceptable as worthy of our efforts.

To pursue this approach will call for a philosophy substantially different from that which has usually guided epidemiological studies. We cannot ignore the usefulness of knowledge of specific etiologic factors; however, we should concern ourselves with clusters of causes and combinations of effects and how they relate to each other.—REUEL A. STALLONES, School of Public Health, University of Texas, P.O. Box 20186, Astrodome Station, Houston, Texas 77025

This editorial is excerpted from Environment, Ecology, and Epidemiology, Scientific Publication No. 231 (Pan American Health Organization, Washington, D.C., 1971).