

# Response to Criticism

The Manufacturing Chemists' Assn. and the National Agricultural Chemical Assn. are taking a joint approach to the problem of rebutting Rachel Carson's criticism of current use of pesticides in her recent three-part (June 16, 23, 30) *New Yorker* magazine series.

MCA and NACA have set off their campaign with a joint general statement, stressing that the industry has traditionally been concerned with the proper use of its hazardous products and will continue to be.

"Hazards can't be eliminated," say the associations, "in any phase of man's existence." This is true, they add, "in the use of chemicals as it is in the use of atomic energy, or the automobile. But where the need is vital, and where men are aware of the risks and are determined to reduce them to the absolute minimum, a great deal can be done."

In addition to the joint statement, NACA has issued a supplementary bulletin pointing out that pesticides have been a subject of controversy since '27. In effect, NACA says, Miss Carson's charges are not new.

Next step: preparation of a point-by-point rebuttal of the general charges made by Miss Carson. This will be done in a "fact vs. fallacy" paper citing scientific authorities' findings against some of the statements in the *New Yorker* series.

The joint action by MCA and NACA should not only help counter adverse criticism rising from the articles but also help set the record straight for Book-of-the-Month Club readers, when the series is issued in book form.