



Our Sample Injector: it's the standard.

When we introduced the Rheodyne Model 7120 Syringe Loading Sample Injector in early 1976, we knew it was a good product.

Now, we suspect, it might be a great product. According to the best educated guesses we can make, it's the best selling sample injector around by a factor of three to one. Why?

Because it does the job well, because we keep improving it, because we give you good delivery, because we give you good service.

Technically the Model 7120 gives you maximum versatility in HPLC sample injection. You load the sample by syringe through a built-in needle port. For maximum precision use conventional loop filling or partial loop filling with only 0.5 μ l sample loss. Removable sample loops are available from 10 μ l to 2 ml. The valve will withstand 7000 psi operating pressure. And at \$490, there's simply no better price/performance value on the market.

Over the years, the product gets better. With thousands in the field, it's more reliable. It's easier to turn too. And if you need parts or new valves, we can give you same day service.

If you want us to repair or rework the valve, we'll usually have it on the way back to you within 24 hours.

More information

Our technical bulletin tells the whole story. For your copy, please address Rheodyne, Inc., 2809 Tenth St., Berkeley, CA 94710. Phone (415) 548-5374.


RHEODYNE

THE LC CONNECTION COMPANY
Circle No. 229 on Readers' Service Card

very large fraction of it—perhaps all in some species—is directed during the critical early stages by maternal RNA templates. The maternal messages are not genes, to be sure, but they are immediate products of genes, and they carry an enormous amount of genetic information. A conservative average might be the equivalent of 10,000 structural genes. The DNA from which these templates are copies is that of the *mother's* genome, and in the particular cases most likely to be of interest here, it is specifically DNA of the oocyte that is transcribed into RNA during the period of growth in the ovary (2, 3).

The force of this is that an ovum is *not* a genetic tabula rasa; it is not the indifferent branch upon which a foreign shoot is grafted, nor yet the single somatic plant cell induced by a surrogate ovular fluid to produce an entire plantlet. The animal egg is a highly specialized and comparatively huge cell that contains not only a nuclear genome but also a complex (approximately 10^7 nucleotides) derivative genome in the form of very stable messenger RNA, the function of which is to direct the protein synthesis by which divergences of cell type, central to morphogenesis, eventually appear (3). This derivative genetic information is specifically the mother's, *not* the father's nor, obviously, that of a donor cell selected in the laboratory.

It is still too early to say what identifiable features of the adult phenotype are regularly the unique products of maternal messages, but it is certain that they are not trivial features (2); in addition to the universal processes of cleavage, germ-layer formation, and morphogenetic movements in early development, there are certain to be maternally determined external adult characteristics, for example, the equivalent of left-versus right-handed spiraling in some molluscan shells. The mother's genes therefore make in oogenesis a critical and individual contribution to the outcome of animal development, and must do so even if the zygotic nucleus is removed from the fertilized egg.

There is therefore no possibility that a *literal* copy of the donor individual can be produced by the insertion of a somatic nucleus into recipient cytoplasm of a conveniently available egg. A roughly similar individual, yes; but a carbon copy, no. Only the nuclear genes are likely to be pretty accurate copies of the transplanted set. Yet it will be, I predict, the symbolic and emotional content of the carbon copy idea that most excites the popular imagination.

None of this is meant to cast doubt upon the possibility nor the inherent inter-

est of animal cloning. There are other methods than the one about to be sprung on an unsuspecting world by Rorvik's *oeuvre*. Some of those can work in principle, but nobody has come close to succeeding with them, and there isn't much serious effort anyway. None of the alternatives has been mentioned in the press as yet. There are also variations of the nuclear insertion method, involving more than one generation of recipients, that can work in principle, but they are nearly as remote in practical terms. It takes exquisite skill and knowing how to deal with a preponderance of failures to apply such methods even to amphibian eggs. The mammalian egg is an order of magnitude smaller and more fastidious about its environment; its development is an order of magnitude more complex, and each generation requires gestation in utero.

We have, therefore, a long way to go. It is, however, a way that should not be blocked nor impeded by hysterical appeals to Stop Xeroxing People. Besides, the Xerox Corporation is having enough trouble as it is with its common stock.

PAUL R. GROSS

University of Rochester,
Rochester, New York 14627

References

1. P. R. Gross, *Curr. Top. Dev. Biol.* 2, 1 (1967); —, K. W. Gross, A. I. Skoultschi, J. V. Ruderman, *Karolinska Symp. Res. Methods Reprod. Endocrinol.* 6, 244 (1973).
2. E. Davidson, *Gene Activity in Early Development* (Academic Press, New York, ed. 2, 1976).
3. W. H. Rodgers and P. R. Gross, *Cell*, in press.

Geological Survey Director

Deborah Shapley (News and Comment, 10 Mar., p. 1054) has cast an unwarranted slur on the selection of Henry W. Menard as Director of the U.S. Geological Survey.

The headline of her article ("Old boy system produces Geologic Survey chief") implies that Menard was selected by the clandestine pick-up-the-phone-and-call-old-friends method of filling unadvertised positions that is so rightly decried today for shutting out qualified candidates.

Nothing in the article supports this implication. Menard is described as being "one of the boys," and it is noted that his name was not on the original list of five candidates. But isn't there a difference between being one of the boys and being selected for a position through an unjust old-boy network?

DAVID McGEARY

Geology Department, California
State University, Sacramento 95819