

marking and tagging; age and growth; eggs and rearing of larvae; food and digestion rates; mortality; fishery management and particularly good chapters dealing with population numbers and ratio of mortality and production. The latter paper includes the most up to date mathematical formulae for the assessment of production and directs attention to the desirability of making separate assessments of the production of sexual products and the production of somatic tissue.

Two particular aspects of sampling fish populations recur in several chapters and demonstrate how much is still to be accomplished in basic work. The recognition of individual fish is deemed highly desirable for many experimental purposes and tagging of most species is still a very serious problem. The second aspect, selectivity of gear, is referred to time and again by different authors and it is important that users of this handbook are made aware of the very real limitations of some sampling methods when unbiased samples are required for ecological studies, and that vast opportunities remain for discovering and developing new methods of catching fish.

An important section of this book is the reference list of 34 pages listing some 700 papers in many languages. This will be especially useful for the worker with limited access to library facilities.

The editor and authors must be congratulated for the speed with which this book has been published—only one year from the date of the technical meeting at which it was planned. The book is written in English; is it too much to hope that in the not too distant future it may be available in other languages too? It is international in concept and deserves to be of international repute.

JEAN C. McCORMACK

should not be overlooked whenever, in practice, the deficiencies of subject bibliographies would make their use imperative—as, for example, in philosophy, where the current bibliographies are inadequate.

The book seems to go well beyond the needs of the “intelligent layman” and the “student, especially at undergraduate or senior college level” for whom it is intended. The author refers to 186 works, many in foreign languages and of earlier periods—an inventory of major sources that would seem more appropriate to the needs of subject librarians and research workers (though the omissions of guides to research, for example, would reduce its value to both). Additionally, the combination of narrative style and historical approach frequently obscures outstanding current sources: for example, in the chapter on dictionaries the importance of English and English is noted but not demonstrated. The alphabetical listing of sources at the end of the book, though valuable for identification, cannot remedy this limitation. Similarly, the form approach can result in the “loss” of an important work. For example, in the section on guides to the literature, Daniel and Louttit is not mentioned (having been classified under handbooks). History and form sometimes take precedence over function: in the section on current bibliographies in psychology the student will learn more about the development of bibliographies than the characteristics and uses of the various types.

It is, perhaps, unfair to mention such limitations in so short a review. Certainly it would be inexcusable to end without stating that this book will be extremely valuable in plugging a gap in subject bibliography.

C. D. NEEDHAM

HOW TO FIND OUT

How to Find Out in Philosophy and Psychology

By D. H. Borchardt. (The Commonwealth and International Library of Science, Technology, Engineering and Liberal Studies: Library and Technical Information Division.) Pp. vii + 97. (Pergamon: Oxford, London and New York, 1968.) 20s.

THIS book, by the chief librarian of La Trobe University, Australia, aims to give a “broad introduction to the literary guides to philosophy and psychology”. Four of the six chapters (excluding the introduction) are about bibliographies, the other two cover dictionaries and encyclopaedias, societies and associations. It is not a select bibliography of these subjects, and those who come to it for some indication of the major texts, series, periodicals, and so forth, will be disappointed. Within the limited terms of reference it can scarcely be faulted on its basic content: the major guides are here, and the citations are up to date. The omission of the recent *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* makes the chapter on encyclopaedias defective—but, of course, this is no criticism of a work the preface of which is dated November 1966.

One could question the choice of topics in the chapter on “specialized fields”. Child psychology, tests, psychiatry and mental health, and psychoanalysis seem a somewhat arbitrary representation of the subfields of psychology; and if *Excerpta medica* is to be mentioned under psychiatry, why not *Index medicus*? I find the author’s note on his principles of selection here not altogether convincing. At the other end of the scale the omission of many general bibliographies—major national bibliographies, for example—might also be questioned. Naturally one cannot expect each title in a series such as this simply to repeat such sources, and the author does refer to the general guide, Dr Chandler’s *How to Find Out*. Nevertheless, such sources as the catalogues of the Library of Congress and the *British National Bibliography*

CORRESPONDENCE

Tobacco and Tobacco Smoke

SIR,—Although we normally accept the convention that authors should not comment on statements made by reviewers on their books, we feel, however, that if such statements contain errors of fact which might mislead the reader, corrections are in order (*Nature*, 219, 98; 1968).

Dr Passey refers to calculations on one of our experiments published in 1953, and to more recent studies, in terms of biological response when animals receive tobacco “tar”. We have repeatedly emphasized that to begin to compare experiments from one country with another or even one laboratory with another can only properly be done if at least the same dose has been applied. We know of no experiments done in the early part of the 1950s which permit such a comparison to our early study. In subsequent years, there has been a reduction in tumorigenic activity of tobacco “tars” which we have related to a marked change in the make-up of cigarettes (page 142). Our present results are quite similar to those reported by Day. As a matter of mathematics, when Dr Passey notes that Day reported only 3 per cent of malignant tumours of 7,875 mice, he included in this figure mice receiving a low “tar” dose (25 mg) and even the control animals which obviously received no “tars”. For example, among mice receiving 100 mg of stored condensate three times a week, 14.85 per cent developed carcinoma of the skin. Thus the actual percentage of malignant tumours in the study animals treated with “tar” roughly corresponds to the dose applied by us and is similar to our findings today (15 per cent; *Nat. Cancer Inst. Monogr.*, 28, 168; 1968).

Dr Passey states also that the fact that the incidence of cancer of the oral cavity is relatively stable while cancer of the lung is increasing speaks against a direct carcinogenic action of tobacco smoke because the contact of tobacco smoke is greater in the oral cavity. For one thing, the incidence patterns of these two cancer sites cannot be