

chromatography analysis, was 18 parts per million. This system at the same time was being subjected to significant concentrations of heavy metals contributed by another industry. This problem has since been eliminated, but the sewage plant continues to experience operating problems.

A full-scale investigation is in progress to determine the concentration of both biphenyls and PCB's in several water supplies and wastewater systems in the area and their effects on bacteria and protozoa.

In 1966, the wisdom of using chlorine in waste treatment processes was seriously questioned (1) after an investigation revealed the presence of halophenols in waste-water systems. Reynolds (2) has stated: "The means by which PCB's enter the ecosystem to contaminate fish and wildlife are still not clearly understood." Answers will come only from research.

PETER E. GAFFNEY

Department of Biology,
Georgia State University,
Atlanta 30303

References

1. R. S. Ingols, P. E. Gaffney, P. C. Stevenson, *J. Water Pollut. Control Fed.* **38**, 629 (1966).
2. L. M. Reynolds, *Residue Rev.* **34**, 34 (1971).

Instability of N-Nitrosamides

The letter from A. H. Sparrow (24 Aug. 1973, p. 700) telling of an accident with nitrosomethylurea comes as no surprise to a chemist familiar with the properties of N-nitrosamides. Some time ago, I received a call from another institution telling of a similar accident with a much smaller quantity of nitrosomethylurea.

The instability of N-nitrosamides, particularly of nitrosoalkylureas, is well known. These compounds must be kept in a freezer, not merely under refrigeration. Not only do they decompose rapidly on occasion, but they can also decompose slowly and polymerize, as I discovered once in carrying some deuterium-labeled nitrosomethylurea across the Atlantic. Because of this instability, quantitative biological or biochemical studies in which improperly stored nitrosamides are used can have little meaning. Without making a chemical analysis before use, the investigator will not know how much of the undecomposed compound is present.

Two conclusions can be drawn from these episodes. First, the storage of a

large quantity of a biologically potent compound such as nitrosomethylurea is inadvisable, particularly when the amounts needed for any experiment are measured in milligrams. Second, the shipping of such unstable compounds (with possible hazards to postal workers and other unwitting handlers of the materials) should be stopped.

When I have been asked by scientists to supply nitrosoalkylureas, my solution to the problem has been to provide a recipe for small amounts of these compounds. Their preparation is extremely simple and can be carried out by someone with a minimal knowledge of chemistry in an afternoon. The starting materials are safe, cheap, and readily available.

WILLIAM LIJINSKY

Oak Ridge National Laboratory,
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

Human Ecology

Amos H. Hawley's critique of ecology (23 Mar. 1973, p. 1196) makes some telling points. Few scientists would disagree with the implication that environmentalist and conservationist extremes are characterized by emotional overstatements and clichés, without objective basis, that fail to qualify as ecology or as any other science. Hawley, furthermore, puts his finger unerringly on the weaknesses inherent in "The scaling down of ecology to manageable proportions. . . ." The study of "relations between given species and particular environmental features" is indeed not so broad as a systems approach (exemplified by the ecosystem concept). And even ecosystem studies suffer unavoidable difficulties stemming from necessary size limitation and (not mentioned by Hawley) their eventual dependence upon all of the mechanisms of species-environment interaction. Hawley is therefore clearly correct in calling attention to the supplementary value of holistic and mechanistic studies. It is regrettable that these insights are progressively forgotten in the remainder of the article.

The professional ecologist's inclusion of man in ecological studies is totally dependent upon *Homo sapiens* being subjected to the same treatment as that accorded every other species. Should it prove inconsequential that bald eagles are exterminated, is it necessarily more tragic to the biosphere if man is the next victim of extinction?

If it is "bad" that beavers cut more trees than they can use, are Hawley and I to be forgiven for the waste of boreal fibers on which we print our differences of opinion? If Garrett Hardin's cows demolish their pasture by being too numerous, does man have some unique quality that guarantees that he will suffer no hunger, whatever the density of his population per unit of space-energy? It would be difficult to support an affirmative answer to any of these questions.

Hawley bases his opinion upon two closely related biases. While it is not denied that Hardin's cows are subject to the Malthusian principle, Hawley excuses man from a comparable fate on the grounds that man has a technology, the product of which increases more rapidly than does human population. It is quite true, as Hawley points out, that this was not anticipated by Malthus. There issues from this disproportion the not very surprising consequence that production comes to exceed the labor force, both quantitatively and in terms of labor's capacity to buy. In the face of this, Hawley argues that "A decline in the relative size of the labor force does not, however, contradict the need for large numbers of people in an industrially advanced society. While such a society needs comparatively few workers, it needs relatively more consumers." (What we really need is more beavers to consume all those wasted trees.)

Totally lacking in Hawley's analysis is any correspondence between his view of the organizational society he wishes to call "human ecology" and the ecosystem approach he seemed to find largely worthy. The material and energy input of the industrial society is not mentioned. While exponential technological development might well have confounded the Reverend Malthus, that worthy gentleman gets the last laugh. Technology suffers from its own Malthusian malaise in the form of diminishing reserves of fuel, strategic materials, and soil, as well as the accumulation of wastes. Meanwhile, its Madison Avenue search for more consumers guarantees ever greater demand for ever scarcer commodities. The first research effort of the new "human ecology" should be a search for just one example of material infinity in nature.

CORNELIUS H. MULLER

Department of Biological Sciences,
University of California,
Santa Barbara 93106