

at very high cost.

Fawcett (1983) discusses other advantages of herbicides relative to tillage for weed control in field crops. He does not consider hand labor as an alternative, presumably because the costs of farm labor in the United States are too high to make that feasible. Herbicides permit earlier planting in the spring than generally would be possible if weeds were to be controlled by cultivation. The reason is that when soil temperatures are cool, as in early spring, many weeds grow faster than emerging corn and soybean plants. Herbicides permit control of these weeds.

Another advantage of herbicides is that they give easier control of weeds in the crop row, as noted in the CAST report. Fawcett (1983, p. 2) states that this permits higher seeding densities, hence higher crop yields. He says that weeds in the row probably can also be controlled with "... biological farming, but it is going to be tougher" than controlling them with herbicides.

Fawcett also asserts that herbicides give greater flexibility in the timing of cultivation. "Nearly all Iowa farmers still row cultivate... But they don't have to be in there in a very timely manner like we do when we eliminate the use of herbicides" (Fawcett, 1983, p. 2).

Finally, and perhaps most important, although Fawcett does not label it so, herbicides permit continuous cropping, that is to say they permit farmers to keep more of their land in relatively high value uses more of the time than would be possible in a rotational system for weed control.

The literature reviewed gives less attention to the economic effects of the ban on insecticides in alternative farming systems. Indeed we have found no discussion addressed specifically to these effects. An adverse indirect effect can be inferred, however, from the fact that insect control is one of the important reasons why alternative systems rotate land among various