

see how
clearly
you can see
how deep
our new
cage
is?



You're looking through our new deep plastic cage for rodents. It clearly anticipates new public law requirements. It all adds up to new convenience for you: More room under the feed hopper. More usable floor space for your research animals. Or more room for additional animals.

It's from Lab Products, Inc., a new company of experienced people with new ideas for your animal care needs. We offer a broad-line of plastic cages, accessories, bedding (e.g., ab-sorb-dri®), and special animal care systems.

We've got them all in a new catalog. For your copy, write or phone Doug Anderson, Lab Products, Inc., 633 Midland Avenue, Garfield, N.J. 07026. Phone: 201-478-3000.

lab products
inc

Circle No. 79 on Readers' Service Card

Recalcitrant Honey Bees

The fine discussion by Gould *et al.* (1) is a worthy continuation of the series by Von Frisch (2) and Wenner *et al.* (3) which I have followed in *Science* with fascination. Gould points up the ever greater ambiguity of honey bee behavior, an ambiguity that may be unresolvable, considering that we scarcely understand rat behavior, much less our own.

The following experiment in the genre is unusually clear-cut, however. I placed a hive of honey bees (*Apis*) in the middle of a large open field (1 hectare, or 10 meters \times 1000 meters), then walked to one end of the field and constructed a feeding station. No sooner (5 to 30 seconds) had I placed the feeding solution in the dish, than the entire swarm of bees descended and began to feed. They apparently had been waiting nearby in a tree. I was unable to repeat the experiment, because, when they finished, the bees left and have not been seen since (by me), no doubt being impatient of such pointless (to them) games, or afraid of being "discarded" (1, p. 547). This may or may not be true.

Several things are immediately clear. Bees always seem to know a little better than the experimenter just what they are about. They seem to think along somewhat the same lines that we do, but to a little better effect. And they pursue their ends doggedly, altering their response to fit the situation, being altogether humorless, at least under scrutiny.

My own experiments in this field have thus ended. I should advocate, however, that the funds for ABM and SST be diverted to other scholars interested in apiology, a pleasant occupation and a less harmful one (except to bees).

FRED G. HILL

14 Cottage Grove Avenue,
South Burlington, Vermont 05401

References

1. J. L. Gould, M. Henerey, M. C. MacLeod, *Science* **169**, 544 (1970).
2. K. von Frisch, *ibid.* **158**, 1072 (1967).
3. A. M. Wenner, *ibid.* **155**, 847 (1967); D. L. Johnson, *ibid.*, p. 844; A. M. Wenner and D. L. Johnson, *ibid.* **158**, 1076 (1967); A. M. Wenner, P. H. Wells, D. L. Johnson, *ibid.* **164**, 84 (1969).

Brutus Struck Down

In his editorial "Science: Attack and defense" (14 Aug., p. 633), Thimann's logic slipped a little with his conclu-

sion, "No, the only effective defense of science is through strengthening science itself." And by this he means, among other things, "our devotion to our research and teaching . . . and lively awareness of useful and humane applications." I doubt if one can teach science to alert college students today without extending the boundary of science to include, as an intrinsic part of each discipline, the value judgments concerning the place of one's subspecialty within the societal perspective. Useful and humane application is mainly what the nonscience community is asking for. Science shares the responsibility for the utilization of knowledge and its best defense is to attack the two-valued, but obsolete, split between science and society.

STANFORD C. ERICKSEN

Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor 48104

Look here, Professor Thimann, you and I are in our 60's—not far from death. We may die like animals, not knowing where we came from or where we are going. It cannot be too soon for us to demand that science and religion find out why we are here and where we are going. In your "only effective defense of science," you completely overlook the idea that science is the means and method for discovering man's destiny. Science uninvolved in a search and conquest of man's place in the universe is a science beheaded.

Science has failed to integrate with religion. Instead, theology, the authoritative type of thinking of Aristotle, is still the method of religion. Science is actually inseparable from religion; science should be the method, and religion the goal in the search for the meaning of life. But currently in the United States, science is mostly the basis for technological progress and industrial wealth. Nowhere is science basically the means for discovering the creativity of our universe. . . .

B. B. STOLLER

Stoller Research Company,
Post Office Box 1071,
Santa Cruz, California 95060

Thimann's fine message on behalf of science should be taken to heart by all who read it. His recommendation, however, that we emulate Brutus in disregarding threats is rather dangerous. Let us review what happened to "the noblest Roman of them all."

An impractical visionary of lofty