are regarded by critics as representative of the poet's work—with the possible exception of the work of William Carlos Williams, for the omission of which there can be no excuse.

But this oversight on my part only highlights the more the fact that the scientific orientation of a poet's thoughts or emotions is the one aspect that literary discussion and criticism consistently neglect. This in turn emphasizes the urgency of focusing attention on the relationship of science to poetry and to literature in general.

On the curricular and pedagogic level the implication for me is that some agency should be set up to cull our imaginative literature, both prose and poetry, for revealing instances of the successful integration of scientific ideas and images with lyrical or imaginative expression and to bring these to the attention of teachers and students through recommended reading lists and anthologies. These will, in time, affect the standard syllabi and the standard literary anthologies. Such an agency would have to be charged with both research and public education.

On the creative and critical levels, new works incorporating the scientific outlook might be fostered by conferring the recognition and prestige of scientific bodies on them in some way, or by setting up an agency to do so, which might be a link between the humanities and science.

It might be well for scientific societies, the various manpower agencies, or associations of technologic firms to consider creating such an agency for its ultimate effect on our culture and our scientific manpower resources. What seems to be most needed is an instrument for closer liaison of the humanities and science, not only in organizational terms (between, say, scientific professional groups and literary and scholarly associations), but also in terms of research, intercommunication, and publicity.

JOSEPH GALLANT
Theodore Roosevelt High School, New York, N. Y.

Radiation and Health

I can only partially agree with the statements expressed in your editorial, "Radiation and health" [*Science* **125**, 719 (19 Apr. 1957)]. The information on the radiation genetics of our species is exceedingly meagre, and currently we are forced to extrapolate from data collected by radiation geneticists working on the mouse, fruitfly, and various plants and microorganisms. To collect data for our species, we shall have to gather every scrap of information that results from each sizable exposure of the human reproductive system to ionizing radiation. Presumably, such exposures can occur accidentally or from medical diagnostic and therapeutic procedures.

I will grant that a record of exposures may be of no value to the individual keeping it, since the decision to expose this individual to further x-rays is primarily governed by the need for medical diagnosis or therapy. This is not the point, however. The value of records of this kind is that as they accumulate and the pedigrees of exposed individuals become available, only then can the geneticist attempt, from an analysis of these data, to determine the exact magnitude of the radiation hazard to the human germ plasm.

When one is ignorant admit it, proceed cautiously, and attempt to remedy the situation. In genetics, as G. Mendel has observed, the only way to remedy ignorance is to engage in the bookkeeping necessary for the construction of pedigrees. The answer to the question "Would the considerable effort required to keep such records for a large part of the population be worth while?" is an unqualified *Yes.*

ROBERT C. KING
Department of Biological Sciences, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois