been my favorite letter (I was practically raised on Oxo), and Xenia is a lovely name and a nice little town. But I did only need 19 consonants, and arbitrariness pursues us even across the savannahs of the blue; it is History, not Science, which gives us 360 degrees, from the Babylonians to the Bahai. But x has glories more renowned than numerology, for what is more splendid than the Unknown? And what more glorious symbol is there for that infinite pursuit of the unknown which is the Being of Science and the End of History?

KENNETH E. BOULDING
Department of Economics,
University College of the West Indies,
Kingston, Jamaica

Genetical Theory

Lederberg's remarks in his Nobel address [*Science* **131**, 269 (1960)] demonstrate his commitment to the deoxyribonucleic acid hypothesis and show how a dominant theory enables its proponent to ignore other points of view. A section on the origin of life contains no references to Oparin [*The Origin of Life on the Earth* (Academic Press, New York, 1957)], Miller [*Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci.* **69**, 260 (1957)], or Fox [AAAS General Symposium (26 Dec. 1959)]. Pirie [*Intern. Council Sci. Unions Rev.* **1**, 40 (1959)] is described as (of all things!) an "agnostic." The numerous experiments reported from this laboratory [*Proc. Intern. Genet. Symposium No. 42* (1957)], which demonstrate that various carbohydrates will transform a recessive gene into a dominant gene, are disregarded.

Is it proper to ignore the views and the supporting evidence of others in full knowledge? It has become the current practice of proponents of a genetical theory not to comment on work incompatible with the theory. Sinoto's [*Proc. Intern. Congr. Genet. 10th Congr.* (1958), vol. 2, p. 262] recent confirmation of Lysenko's original experiments (which have not been considered seriously by most Western geneticists because of their conflict with Mendelism) is a case in point. It is now apparent that a considerable revision of views (both by East and West) must occur before a comprehensive genetical theory can be achieved. If current reviewers of genetics stated the limitations under which they were writing, it would explain their failure to refute excluded items. Otherwise they arbitarily narrow the extent of the scientific enterprise.

CARL C. LINDEGREN
Biological Research Laboratory,
Southern Illinois University,
Carbondale