

Circle No. 92 on Readers' Service Card

over the Amazon basin at an altitude of about 2000 feet. According to pilots and residents subsequently interviewed in this area, the haze has become a daily weather feature over the past 2 years, coinciding with the discovery of major oil fields in northeastern Ecuador and the burning-off of the new wells. Columns of smoke from burning wells were observed and photographed across the entire horizon on these flights. Rainfall records kept at Limoncocha indicate that the average annual rainfall has increased from about 100 inches (1961 to 1970) to 140 inches today. It seems likely that particulate matter in the haze is serving as nuclei for condensation and thus leading to greater levels of precipitation, as occurred in the area of La Porte, Indiana, which is east of Chicago and Gary (1).

This ecological change, whether it is caused by air pollutants released by the burning oil wells or by unknown longterm cyclical factors, should be carefully studied by scientists working in the western Amazon basin in future months. The consequences of widespread rainfall changes in the tropics are of obvious economic, agricultural, and ecological importance to the developing countries.

THOMAS C. EMMEL

Department of Zoology, University of Florida.

Gainesville 32601

References

1. T. C. Emmel, An Introduction to Ecology and Population Biology (Norton, New York, 1973), p. 144.

Radiation Effects

Harald Trefall (Letters, 23 Nov. 1973, p. 776) raises questions about the effects of radiation as represented in Gillette's review (News and Comment, 1 Dec. 1972, p. 966) of the BEIR (Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiations) report (1). A careful reading of the report would answer most of Trefall's questions, particularly his semantic difficulties with the expression "extra deaths," which incidentally was not used in the report (illogically or otherwise). However, there is an urgent need for the public to understand about the biological costs of the side effects of technology (including radiation), particularly about the comparative risks of available options, so that logical decisions about new or expanding technologies can be made and accepted.

Trefall oversimplifies in stating that agents can "cause premature deaths, no more and no less" and in proposing that effects of radiation exposure be expressed in terms of average reduced life-span. The ethical ideal that every being has a right to be born without man-induced defects and to die from old age (the natural wearing out of the body) is fully recognized. However, it is obvious that all early deaths do not have the same societal and personal impact. For example, the death of an embryo before anyone even knows about it or the death of an elderly person a few years before he or she would otherwise die of old age would not penalize the individual, the persons left behind, or society, as would the death of a young adult with family responsibilities on the brink of a productive career. In addition, genetic effects can produce a variety of suffering and health costs over a lifetime which, while they do not necessarily cause early deaths, do constitute a biological cost. At present, it is not possible in the formulation of radiation risk values to estimate the number of person-years lost because of the agent and somehow to weight them so that societal and personal considerations are taken into account. With more data and competence we hope to move in this direction.

In the meantime, the genetic risk estimates in the BEIR report refer to the production per year by additional radiation of cases of serious, dominant, or X-linked diseases and defects plus congenital abnormalities and constitutional diseases that are partly genetic. The somatic risk estimates refer to annual excess mortality from cancer that could be produced by the additional radiation. It may be that such numbers, used by themselves out of context, do sound "horrible" and tend to overemphasize the risk; on the other hand, the calculations of average life-span reduction proposed by Trefall do not seem to convey an easily understood sense of reality, especially in terms of the possible effects on individuals.

C. L. COMAR

Department of Physical Biology, New York State Veterinary College, Cornell University, Ithaca 14850

References

 The Effects on Populations of Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation (Report of Advisory Committee on the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiations, National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council) (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1972).

SCIENCE, VOL. 183