the concept of true science or true humanism or misunderstanding of certain value systems.

Familiarization with the moral objections to utilization of certain contraceptive methods reveals that the concept of totality of marital love demands the complete oblation of the entire persons in such a sublime communion. The theologian R. A. McCormick, S.J., has recently discussed the Catholic position in some detail ["Conjugal love and conjugal morality," *America* 110, 38 (1964)].

ROMAN A. SCHMITT

2181 March Place, San Diego 10, California

## Hazards of Pesticides

Thanks are due to Elinor Langer and Science for the description (News and Comment, 3 Apr., p. 35) of the Lower Mississippi fish kill by pesticides. Information on this very serious state of aquatic affairs is much needed, and it is to be hoped that Science will continue with other articles as new information develops. This Lower Mississippi fish kill would seem to be so important that it is surprising that it is not first-page news all over the country.

Since Rachel Carson's Silent Spring there has been a rash of pamphlets attempting to justify the widespread use of pesticides. These publications make interesting reading in the light of recent events in the Father of Waters. In spite of repeated assurances that endrin and dieldrin were safe, obviously they are not safe. They have not been adequately tested. Have any of the new insecticides been adequately tested? Perhaps this is a good time to rethink the problem of release of poisonous materials in the environment. A few suggestions for changes in the program might be in order:

- 1) Stop the use of endrin and dieldrin immediately and destroy all stocks of these poisons. They are obviously too persistent and too dangerous to
- 2) Restudy all insecticides which are persistent enough to show any accumulation from season to season in soil, water, or organisms.
- 3) Retest all insecticides. Those in use have been declared "safe." Safe for what? Man only? It is possible that long-term ecological effects of the use of these materials may be more

detrimental than the effects of the insects they control.

4) Greatly expand research into methods of biological control of individual species of pests. Species differ in structure and function or they would not be called species. Concentrated study of each species may show points of attack by which the species may be controlled without playing havoc with the rest of the environment.

F. J. TREMBLEY

Department of Biology, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

I believe that a publication like Science, which is for people presumably dedicated to objectivity, should be above such articles as the one by Elinor Langer headed "Pesticides: Minute quantities linked with massive fish kills; federal policy still uncertain." The article begins by stating as fact something which has been very carefully qualified in several other reports. It goes on to present a distorted point of view and condemns the role of government in regulating pesticide usage as "weak and confused," "piecemeal and inadequate"; "results are often dissipated in political and bureaucratic bickering." This seems grossly unfair, unless one believes that any commercial product should be banned by Washington edict upon receipt of the first report that it might be causing trouble. The article leaves the impression that the various programs for registration, recommendation, and use of pesticides are haphazard and based on inadequate evidence, when in fact they constitute one of the best-ordered complex undertakings in our society.

The use of pesticides is essential for the continued production of food and fiber crops, for the protection of human health through control of lice, flies, rats, cockroaches, and for such miscellaneous purposes as control of undesirable species of fish. The state agricultural experiment stations, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the Food and Drug Administration all have very strong programs aimed at the control of pests with minimum danger to the crop or to the consumer. Any change in those programs should be based on a careful evaluation of facts, not on emotions or possibilities.

No responsible official will deny that some pesticides, especially when misused in high concentrations, can be dangerous. The public has a right to know about this danger, and people are being warned repeatedly in every possible manner. However, in our worry about this problem, let's not lose sight of the fact that we must have food and clothing from crops whose production would be impossible or much more expensive without pesticides. In particular, the city dweller should be given a balanced account of the situation, because he knows the least about agriculture.

F. H. Lewis

Agricultural Experiment Station, Pennsylvania State University, Arendtsville

Lewis's suggestion that the Mississippi fish kills are the "first report" that the pesticides in question "might be causing trouble" seems to me to overlook substantial information acquired by the Fish and Wildlife Service and by independent investigators, not to mention Rachel Carson and the President's Science Advisory Council panel. Also, although Lewis's loyalty to the Department of Agriculture is commendable, not even Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman would care to defend the thesis that the registration of pesticides "constitute[s] one of the best-ordered complex undertakings in our society." In testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations on 15 April, Freeman described how a proposal, which he favored, for more exchange of information between federal agencies on pesticide registrations had been held up since last June by "the usual pulling, tugging, and hauling that goes on between government departments." He also acknowledged that coordination among federal agencies in investigating the fish kills had been "very poor." Trembley will be pleased to note that Freeman also called for a crash program to develop environmental and biological methods of pest control.—Elinor Langer

## Multiple Authors and Indexes

I would like to amplify Page's theme in his editorial "Some perils of authorship" (10 Apr., p. 139) with pragmatic, though tangential, information. Although Page examines policies pertaining to primary publications, he neglects the important subject of secondary publication through indexing and abstracting media.