

Entomologists Vote to Join CAST

The Entomological Society of America (ESA) has decided to join the Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST) by a vote of 1086 to 802. ESA has over 7000 members eligible to vote. The question of affiliation with CAST had been warmly debated within ESA (*Science*, 20 August) because CAST, which operates as a nonprofit, educational organization, receives substantial support from the pesticide industry.

CAST's primary function is the production of reports on agricultural science subjects by task forces whose members are drawn mainly from scientific societies affiliated with CAST. Affiliation will entail financial contributions to CAST by ESA, but the ESA board has determined that the money will not come from ESA general funds. It is expected that ESA members interested in supporting CAST work will be asked to add a sum—probably \$1—to their dues voluntarily.—J.W.

adequacy of research and record keeping on pesticide poisoning among farmworkers and asserts there is evidence that there is much more illness than is treated, let alone reported. The authors also claim that there are signs that pesticide effects are especially serious for the young, the old, persons in ill health, and pregnant women, groups heavily represented among field-workers.

The report acknowledges that pesticide regulation in recent years has limited the use of some pesticides and improved pesticide application methods, but argues that the system, which relies mainly on a network of pest control advisers and on an inadequate inspection

and enforcement system, needs substantial improvement and, particularly, that advisers need better training to wean them from an "uncritical chemical approach" to pest control.

In their recommendations, the authors urge that pest control advisers not be directly or indirectly employed by agricultural chemical companies as many of them now are. They recommend also that the advisers not profit personally from application of any pest control method whether it be chemical control or biological control.

The main thrust of the recommendations is that integrated pest management techniques be given broader scope

through better training of pest control advisers, revision of laws which affect food quality standards, and education of consumers in the options that would be available if cosmetic food standards were modified.

One weakness of the report stems from the lack of solid data on the portion of pesticide use which can be attributed specifically to cosmetic requirements. Van den Bosch claims, however, that the group was hindered throughout the study by the suspicion and hostility of growers and processors. He insists there were attempts to influence university officials to block the study. He also claims that a survey of growers, counted on to provide information on the matter of cosmetic use, was stopped on order of the Office of Management and Budget. EPA officials say that the survey was not in the original plan and not necessary to the study as designed, and that OMB was simply applying the rules. Van den Bosch, however, charges that the survey was blocked because a representative of canning interests brought the survey to the attention of a senior figure in the university agricultural science community, a consultant with EPA, who raised the issue with OMB. The person named flatly denied the allegation. Van den Bosch says he dropped the matter of the survey to prevent embarrassment of EPA officials.

The question of the amount of pesticide use attributable to cosmetic requirements was raised in the 55-page CAST critique of the report, which noted a "failure to make sufficient connection between the effect of food standards on the use of pesticides." The CAST review found the report unbalanced because it dwelt on "negative impacts to public health and environmental quality," and commented that "instances of substantial inaccuracy, misinformation, and incomplete information abound."

In a page-by-page exegesis, the review takes issue with the report on both fact and interpretation. One representative section takes issue on a major point as follows.

"The proposal that 'integrated pest management' is 'the' alternative is presented as though it were readily available. In no case has the integration of the factors then listed . . . taken place. The idealized concept is fine, but it should be presented as the research approach (which it is), and it should be made clear that the ideal exists nowhere at present and is scarcely 'the' alternative. . . ."

The CAST review spurred van den Bosch's counterattack in the ESA affiliation debate and led to a stiff exchange in

Briefing

Science Adviser Installed

H. Guyford Stever, unofficially engaged to be President Ford's science adviser for some months now, finally said "I do" in a brief ceremony in the White House cabinet room on 12 August. (The Senate confirmed him following hearings on 28 July.)

In attendance at the low-key ceremony were a modest gaggle of White House and National Science Foundation employees, as well as HEW health secretary Theodore Cooper, who had just attended a White House signature session to launch the swine flu program. Only two reporters were present.

Although he may soon be doing battle with a scientifically literate opponent, Ford did not exploit the opportunity to sing paeans to science. He merely noted that he had had a "great interest in sci-

ence and technology," particularly the space program, since his first days in Congress and that he had been on the committee that put the "S" in NASA. He noted that the country was "very, very fortunate to have a man like Guy Stever" to bring science back to the White House.

Vice President Nelson Rockefeller, who has been a big science adviser booster, was called on to administer the oath to Stever because all the Supreme Court justices were on vacation.

Following the ceremony Stever and his wife departed for New Hampshire to go fishing.

The next day the White House announced the appointment of Simon Ramo, the "R" in the aerospace firm of TRW Inc., to the chairmanship of the new President's Committee on Science and Technology, which is to conduct a 2-year study of the federal science establishment.—C.H.