



Right down to the last drop... without tipping or shaking. Just squeeze. The dispensing tube in the Nalgene Unitary Wash Bottle goes all the way to the bottom. And, it's molded as part of the body. No seams, no leaks. The integral snap-on closure can't be lost.

The Nalgene Wash Bottle is more efficient than anything else available. Proof that Nalge is the innovator in plastic labware.

Specify Nalgene Labware from your lab supply dealer. Ask for our 1968 Catalog, or write Dept. 21181, Nalgene Labware Division, Rochester, New York 14602.



NALGE
BITTER PFAUDLER CORPORATION

pertinent historical review of molecular biology ("That was the molecular biology that was," 26 Apr., p. 390), Stent makes no mention of the definitive proof of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) as the basic hereditary substance by O. T. Avery, C. M. MacLeod, and H. McCarty [*J. Exp. Med.* **79**, 137 (1944)]. The growth of the informationist school of molecular biology rests upon this experimental proof.

Historical recognition is due those whose work has stimulated an army of recruits to enlist in a new field of science. I am old enough to remember the excitement and enthusiasm induced by the publication of the paper by Avery, MacLeod, and McCarty. Avery, an effective bacteriologist, was a quiet, self-effacing, nondisputatious gentleman. These characteristics of personality should not prevent the general scientific public represented by the audience of *Science* to let his name go unrecognized.

CARL LAMANNA

Office of the Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C. 20310

Even though my essay was not intended to be a definitive history of molecular biology and hence kept the number of names mentioned to a, quite possibly scurrilous, minimum, I do agree, in retrospect, with Lamanna's stricture that I really *should* have made explicit mention of Avery's proof during the Romantic Period that DNA is the hereditary substance. However, Lamanna's assertion that "the growth of the informationist school of molecular biology rests upon this experimental proof" is, in my opinion, quite untrue. As I shall set forth in more detail elsewhere, Avery's 1944 discovery made a surprisingly small impact on geneticists, both molecular and classical, for many years, and it was only the Hershey-Chase experiment of 1952 which caused these people to focus on DNA. The reason for this delay was neither that Avery's work was unknown to or mistrusted by them nor that the Hershey-Chase experiment was technically superior. Instead, Avery's proof had been merely "premature," in that the views generally held about the structure of DNA in the 1940's, particularly the "tetranucleotide" hypothesis, did not, as I trust Lamanna also remembers, provide any theoretical framework within which the role of DNA as carrier of hereditary information could be understood. By the time of the Hershey-Chase experiment, however, the notion of

DNA as a long polynucleotide of variable nucleotide sequence had gained currency, and now, as demanded by Eddington's Rules of doing science, confidence could be placed in the experimental findings because they were confirmed by theory.

GUNTHER S. STENT

Department of Molecular Biology, University of California, Berkeley

Rice: Expansion, Not Explosion

Far be it from Rice University to squander a massive \$33 million on the few projects mentioned in "News in Brief" (12 Apr., p. 169). We'll handle these projects with the \$1-million grant from the Ford Foundation. Inadvertently *Science* gave its readers the impression that Rice had succeeded in squeezing a Saturn rocket engine into a Tin Lizzy.

Proceeds from our 3-year \$33-million campaign are to be used for a major 10-year expansion program of Rice University. By the end of May, the drive had reached a total of \$32.5 million in gifts and pledges. It will be concluded in December of this year.

Here's the correct breakdown of our \$33-million campaign: \$6 million for scholarships and fellowships; \$6 million for faculty; \$2.5 million for architecture and fine arts; \$1.2 million for engineering; \$600,000 for biology; \$600,000 for mathematical sciences; \$1.5 million for physics and chemistry; \$2 million for our Fondren Library; \$1 million for major equipment; \$7 million for undergraduate housing; \$1.3 million for graduate housing; \$300,000 for health center; and \$3 million for immediate working capital needs. Not included in the \$33-million campaign are Rice University's long-range requirements, including a graduate school of management which may cost \$8.5 million and a 3000-seat auditorium with a \$3.7-million cost estimate.

The above clarification should give some measure of hope to those of your readers whose faith in the shrinking dollar is hanging by the thinnest of threads. To this I wish to add that even in Texas we still tend to be cautious with millions and would not think of forcing \$33 million down the slender throat of a \$1-million project.

LELAND L. ESTES

Development Office, Rice University, Houston, Texas 77001