following morning, and shortly thereafter my barn went intensely paramagnetic (kiddophilic and mammaphobic). It took me 10 days to crawl out from under the crowd. Meanwhile the press forged two versions of the story—the humorous side captioned by such headlines "Pied Piper Sends 'em Back," "Science at Work." "Researcher Avenged with Mouse-ola,'" "One Jolly Hickory Dickory Doc," "Of Mice and Mangun," "Doc Makes Town Crawl," and "Mangun, Merry Mouse Man of Mendham." No one thought to call me the Pied Pipetter. Except for the original story in the Newark *News*, all versions edited out the *only* in my original statement and used the statement out of context.

Some papers ignored the tongue-in-cheek vein of the original story and quoted me as saying I was taking revenge against the township. I have never made any such statement. Retribution is proceeding sanely by due democratic process.

I have learned the hard way that research is looked upon by some as "just a way to make a buck." In part this may be due to the confusion existing in the mind of the public as to the distinction between basic scientific research, applied research and technology, and manufacturing laboratories. Fear and distrust of the scientist were also abundantly evident in the attitude of a few of the objectors, who had some almost amusing Frankensteinian qualms.

Well, it's been fun and most educational to operate a laboratory on an isolated farm. At the same time I have obtained a lot of very interesting data on enzymes and analgesics. However, I would reccommend that anyone setting up a private research laboratory seriously consider inventing a new name for it—for instance, a "knowledge studio."

GEORGE H. MANGUN
Schoolhouse Lane,
Morristown, New Jersey

The Chinese Chestnut

I noted with interest the photograph of Chinese chestnut nuts, bur, and leaves on the cover of the 25 March issue of *Science* [**131** (1960)].

I have a slight criticism to make about your statement about the Chinese chestnut. You say that widespread planting of the Chinese chestnut "is bringing back the chestnut to the American scene." It is true that we again have nut-producing trees of the chestnut growing in this country, but the Chinese chestnut is very different in its habit of growth from the American chestnut, and it will never replace the native tree. The American chestnut was one of our greatest timber species. It was a tall, stout-growing tree whose wood found many uses, particularly for telephone poles. The Chinese chestnut is almost a shrub in comparison. It is a small-growing tree of unimpressive potentialities as a timber tree. It will never find its way into our native forests. Its best use is as an orchard or lawn tree.

Incidentally, the poetic phrase "Under the spreading chestnut tree" referred to the horse chestnut, a beautiful tree which fortunately is still with us.

ROBERT RODALE
"Organic Gardening and Farming,"
Emmaus, Pennsylvania

Robert Rodale's statement that the Chinese chestnut will never replace the American species as a timber tree is correct. In our description of the cover illustration we did not have the space to point out that "bringing back the chestnut to the American scene" referred to the production of nuts and not to timber. However, Rodale is somewhat misleading when he says the Chinese chestnut is "almost a shrub" in comparison with the American. We know of Chinese chestnut trees that have a trunk more than 2 feet in diameter and are more than 50 feet tall. It is true that the tree does not generally have a straight central trunk, and the top is usually spreading and rounded.

J. W. MCKAY
F. H. BERRY
Crops Research Division,
U.S. Agricultural Research Service,
Beltsville, Maryland

More on Stochastic Models

This note is concerned with a criticism of some of the remarks made by N. E. Manos in his recent letter [*Science* **131**, 1400 (1960)]. Although Manos did not give an indication of what he meant by the much abused term *deterministic*, I assume that he meant it in the sense of entailing a necessary logical relation between the members of a class of prescribed characteristics. The latter is in keeping with E. Nagel's definition of *deterministic* [*Phil. and Phenomenolog. Research* **20**, 291 (1960)].

By way of equilibrating Manos' statement to the effect that many investigators in the physical sciences reject any research which is not deterministic, I wish to point out that much of contemporary philosophy, physics, and electrical engineering is "process-minded"; this includes stochastic processes. Surely, quantum mechanics with its expanding domains of intellectual inquiry and its materialistic yield of the transistor cannot be said to be unrealistic. The statistical model pulled together enough relevant facts long enough so that a human mind could make a significant prediction. The same may be said for the model of communications called "information theory." Further fuel may be added to the fire when we consider D. Bohm's remark, "we may say that the processes taking place in nature may have been found to satisfy laws that are more general than those of causality. For these processes may also satisfy laws of chance. . . ." [*Causality and Chance in Modern Physics* (Van Nostrand, Princeton, N.J., 1957), p. 3]. Probably it is accurate to say that an exclusive use of only determinism or only statistics will make understanding of a scientific endeavor more difficult. Perhaps this is a useful principle of dualism in the interpretation of physics.

Finally, as to Manos' comment, "if the world is basically deterministic," I am of the opinion that we should view the world with any model which is capable of exercising our brains, with some resultant esthetic pleasure, and which shows signs of allowing us to reap material rewards.

A. A. MULLIN
Electrical Engineering Department,
University of Illinois, Urbana

Terrestrial Ostracodes

Ostracodes were recently described at a scientific convention, to a wife who was not a biologist, as "microscopic clams each with a shrimp inside." For almost 200 years they have been known as living and as fossil aquatic bivalved crustaceans that inhabit fresh, brackish, and marine waters.

Menzel [*Arch. Hydrobiol. Planktonk.* **11**, 478 (1916)] described ostracodes from wet moss, but the first known terrestrial species, *Mesocypris terrestris* Harding, 1953 [*Ann. Natal Museum* **12**, 359 (1953)] was described from ordinary damp forest humus obtained at an altitude of 500 feet in the Knysna forest, South Africa. The discovery of these terrestrial forms was incidental to the processing of soil samples in a Berlese funnel in order to collect myriapods and small arachnids. In a later paper, Harding [*Bull. Natl. Inst. Sci. India No. 7* (1955), pp. 104–106] suggested that the water in the form of vapor in a humid atmosphere is sufficient to maintain the terrestrial ostracodes.

Chapman [*Nature (Paris), No. 4706* (1960), p. 121] recorded the presence of ostracodes of the same genus in New Zealand from six localities that range in elevation from 800 to 3200 feet and from a variety of environment, such as