has concluded: "The opinion that in many plants the stimulus of various growth-regulating substances continues for various periods of time is probably based on (1) the continuing activity of the abnormal meristems; and/or (2) the development, long after treatment, of dormant buds injured (while growing) before dormancy. New tissues and organs formed after treatment are not affected."

Taken all together, the present information suggests that distinctions must be made between (*a*) persistence of 2,4-D in plant tissues, and (*b*) delay in visible expression of effects of 2,4-D.

H. B. TUKEY

Department of Horticulture
Michigan State College
East Lansing

Concept of Complementarities

In the interest of accuracy and fairness, the following remarks aim to correct erroneous impressions given by the historical introduction to the interesting paper of A. M. Schechtman and T. Nishihara in SCIENCE, April 7, 1950.

Four years prior to the publication of the paper of Breinl and Haurowitz (1930), I had advanced the concept of antibodies as units complementary to their antigens in addresses before the American Chemical Society and elsewhere. In these talks a coin was used to illustrate the antigen surface, and a piece of tin foil pressed against it formed the specific reverse pattern, illustrating the specific antibody. I pointed out that the top surface of the foil, away from the coin, formed a duplicate of the coin surface, illustrating reproduction at the molecular or near-molecular level of structure. Since some years of public and private discussion developed no objection or alternative view of antibody formation, I sent a paper to an American scientific journal briefly outlining the view. After some consideration, the paper was rejected. It was then sent to another American journal, whose editor, to justify his refusal to publish it, showed me the letter of a prominent "referee," who wrote "there are an infinite number of similar speculations possible." The paper, entitled "Some Intracellular Aspects of Life and Disease," was finally sent to *Protoplasma*, which published it (1931, **14**, 296), with illustrations much like those of Schechtman and Nishihara, except that the latter include the later, more detailed concepts of Linus Pauling.

My *Protoplasma* paper was reviewed in an editorial by Stephen Miall in *Chemistry and Industry* (London, 1932), in which he used the apt engineering term "template" (or templet) to describe the function of the antigen. This term, as well as the coin-foil analogy mentioned above, has become common usage.

Furthermore, "the possibility of applying concept of complementariness to the more general problem of specificity in biological synthesis" had been suggested long before the references quoted by Schechtman and Nishihara; e.g., in a paper by J. Alexander and C. B. Bridges on "Some Physico-chemical Concepts of Life, Mutation, and Evolution" in Vol. II of *Colloid Chemistry* (1928), where still earlier views of Leonard Troland on catalysis are in part reprinted (see also Alexander and Bridges, *Science*, 1929, **70**, 508). Much of the earlier work, with its bearing on embryonic differentiation, is given in *Life, Its Nature and Origin* (1948), by J. Alexander.

JEROME ALEXANDER

50 East 41st Street
New York City

Mr. Alexander's comments on the origin of the idea of complementariness as applied to antigen-antibody relationships will be of interest to persons concerned with the evolution of this line of thought. Our paper (*Science*, 1950, **111**, 357) is not, nor was it meant to be, a comprehensive review; the introductory statement concerning the literature was condensed and presented as a minimal background necessary for the exposition of the experiments described. Nevertheless, several recent review papers by Haurowitz, Pauling, and Tyler (references 4, 10, and 12, respectively) were selected for mention to provide more extensive guides to the literature than was possible in the paper. The references provided by Mr. Alexander will doubtless be a welcome addition for future reviewers who may wish to decide whether the essentials of the idea of molecular complementariness as applied to biological synthesis are rightly attributed to Breinl and Haurowitz.

A. M. SCHECHTMAN and
TOSHIKO NISHIHARA

Department of Zoology
University of California
Los Angeles

Our Flat Planet

Nearly 25 years ago, in Spokane, Washington, a highly reputable and very opinionated local businessman issued a defiant challenge to the entire region in which he lived. His local reputation, he felt, had been endangered by several public arguments in which he stoutly and steadfastly maintained, against all opposition and contradictory to much evidence, that the earth was flat. His challenge to the community was climaxed by an ultimatum published in the forum columns of the leading local newspaper, the *Spokesman-Review*. In effect, his ultimatum told his critics to either "prove they were right or shut up." To back his arguments, he announced in the column that he was placing $1,000 on deposit in the Old National Bank of Spokane and would pay it to any person who could prove that the earth was round.

As long as his mind had to be convinced that the earth was round, his $1,000 remained entirely safe, and the money remained on deposit in the bank for a number of years. Then he triumphantly announced, again in the forum column of the same newspaper, that—having given everyone a chance to submit proof that the earth was round and everyone having failed—he felt deeply grateful that he had been able to prove so conclusively to the entire world that the earth was flat.

Fortunately, not many were affected by his reasoning. The only bad feature about this incident lies in the fact that he is a strong religious leader. Some of the children