

six times as much polonium as the urine of nonsmokers. In the report of the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General on "Smoking and Health" (unfortunately available to me only as reports from Swedish newspapers) it was mentioned as an as yet unexplained observation that heavy cigarette smoking is correlated with an increase not only in lung cancer but also in the bladder-cancer death rate. I want here to draw attention to the possible connections between increased polonium content in the urine and increased death rate from bladder cancer in heavy smokers. Since the tar carcinogens of cigarette smoke seem not to find their way to the urine, the role played by polonium may be a major one for smokers' bladder cancer and perhaps also greater than supposed for lung cancer.

HANNES EISLER
University of Stockholm, Sweden

Safeguarding the Biologic Record

L. F. Yntema's proposal (Letters, 3 Apr., p. 12) that field biologists and biology departments should assume a greater responsibility for the recognition and acquisition of natural areas of scientific value deserves widespread and prompt support. Our department has taken steps in this direction, and its experience might prove useful to others. A departmental committee on natural areas, composed of biologists with a field orientation, locates, visits, and evaluates representative areas of local streams, lakes, forests, and fields. Particular sites are selected for acquisition, priorities are assigned, and departmental approval is sought. The actual work of locating owners, searching titles, and purchasing is done by administrative officers.

Ideally, acquisitions should not be limited to unique biological entities such as bogs, virgin forests, or prairies, but should include large tracts, such as abandoned farmland or cut-over forests, if such are available locally. These tracts are typical of our man-dominated environment and are necessary for the study of contemporary ecological problems. Further, we are acting for future generations as well as ourselves, and such tracts, by natural processes, will ultimately develop climax characteristics.

Yntema has rightly emphasized the

need for natural areas in a program of balanced biology teaching. An even stronger argument for their acquisition can be mustered if the future development of biology departments is considered. The population explosion with its environmental implications fore-shadows a much greater effort in the area of environmental biology. Extensive, diverse, and well-planned holdings of natural areas will be basic to this effort. Perhaps even more important is the fact that these areas will provide a set of natural biological standards against which biologists can measure the success or failure of man in the manipulation of his environment.

F. H. BORMANN
*Department of Biological Sciences,
Dartmouth College,
Hanover, New Hampshire*

I would like to add the following comments to the dialogue stimulated by P. H. Abelson's excellent article "Trends in Scientific Research" (17 Jan., p. 222). I would first like to concur with the general tenor of commentary made by R. H. Painter (Letters, 20 March, p. 1276) against the assumption that all is known about the qualitative composition of the living world. The more support there is for scientific research, the more fields, once unattackable, many previously undeveloped, can be opened up to scientific analysis. But this does not mean that work in the more classical fields "has been largely completed." . . .

There are few geographic areas, save those near the larger universities in Europe and the United States, from which there are even partially complete analyses of the fauna and flora, even in their qualitative aspect, to say nothing of the quantitative picture. The lack of such information is unfortunate because of the great revolutionary changes in environments ushered in by wide use of pesticides, by stream pollution from expanding outputs of industrial wastes, and by air pollution from a variety of causes. It is difficult to perceive how these new factors are affecting segments of the living world when we do not know what that living world is. . . . If we do not know these things, how can we develop ideas on the effects of the new attempts—pragmatic efforts, not scientific endeavors—to modify what has evolved on this planet over countless millions of years? There are many

taxonomic categories about which we know nothing, especially for marine environments. There are known taxa about which we know little, and there are very few segments of the total living world of which we can say we know all about the gross morphology of that phylum, that order, that family, or even that genus . . . vast areas of this fascinating planet are still unknown to descriptive biology.

B. H. BANTA
*Department of Zoology, Colorado
College, Colorado Springs*

Cuba

An author (or editor) often feels like arguing with the reviewer of his book, but knows that this is not in the rules of the game. If I hope for publication of this letter, it is because Adolf A. Berle, in his review of the book *The Atomic Age*, (*Science*, 24 Jan.) ascribed to Leo Szilard a statement taken from my article in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* (Sept. 1960)—that "having mistaken Chinese communists for agrarian reformers, Americans may now be mistaking Cuban agrarian reformers for communists." Szilard has made enough controversial statements of his own; he should not be held responsible for mine!

On this occasion, I would like to say that, in my opinion, this statement has not been revealed as false by subsequent events. Anyone acquainted with the history of the Chinese Communist movement and with the writings of its leaders had no reason to expect from them anything but Communist dictatorship. Castro's revolution, on the other hand, was not predestined to make Cuba a Communist dependency. Several options were open to it, and I believe—but obviously cannot prove!—that the American tendency to treat the Cuban revolution almost from the beginning as a Communist conspiracy contributed to its throwing its lot in with Moscow.

Climbing out still farther on the limb, I suggest that even now Cuba is not irreversibly committed to the status of Moscow satellite. At present, flirtation with Peking is the only way in which Castro can show his independence and extract from Russia a burdensome tribute in support of Cuba's faltering economy. His position, how-