

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I appreciate the cordial co-operation of Dr. Rupert Wenzel, Chairman of the Department of Zoology, and Dr. Eric Smith of the Division of Insects, during my visit to the Field Museum of Natural History.

## LITERATURE CITED

- STRECKER, H. 1876. Lepidoptera, Rhopaloceres and Heteroceres indigenous and exotic. Number 13. Reading, Pa. P. 109-124.  
 ———. 1877. *Id.* Number 14. P. 125-134.  
 ———. 1878. Lepidoptera in Annual report of the engineers for 1878. Appendix SS. Washington, D.C. P. 1750-1865.  
 ———. 1898. Lepidoptera, Rhopaloceres and Heteroceres, indigenous and exotic. Supplement 1. Reading, Pa. P. 1-12, pl. 1, 2.

---

*Journal of the Lepidopterists' Society*  
 32(1), 1978, 54

Letter to the editor:

A Comment on Monarchs and a "Tragedy of the Commons" in Science

When the paper by Urquhart & Urquhart appeared in this journal (1976, Vol. 30: 153-158), I sat down and wrote a letter criticizing the editorial policy of allowing an observation to be published without providing sufficient information to allow verification by other biologists working with Lepidoptera.

While I shared the fear that publication of the exact locale of the Mexican roost would possibly endanger it, I felt that the authors should have at the very least volunteered to disclose the site to responsible qualified scientists researching monarch biology.

Subsequent events have made me regret not sending in my original comment. Incredibly, a scientist of international reputation, Lincoln Brower, was denied the locality information by Professor Urquhart. I do not consider such secrecy to be in the spirit of modern science, nor necessary in this particular instance.

Anyone familiar with Brower's body of work on the monarch would not question his scientific stature. Anyone who has seen his environmental film on the Connecticut River System cannot doubt his sensitivity to ecological problems.

We all respect the effort that Professor Urquhart has put into studying monarch migration. That does not, however, give him territorial rights over monarch roosting areas or free him from the scientific responsibility of allowing other scientists to verify his results.

Much of the controversy and ill will which apparently has followed L. Brower's independent visit to the Mexican monarch roosting area might have been avoided had the study of the monarch proceeded as unselfish science rather than a race for glory in glossy magazines.

In the future I would hope that this journal will insist that authors be willing to disclose their study sites to responsible colleagues.

LAWRENCE E. GILBERT  
 Department of Zoology  
 University of Texas  
 Austin, Texas 78712