Science

Science Service Publication ol. 105/June 15, 1974/No. 24 corporating Science News Letter

Of the Week

380
380
381
381
382
383
383
384
384
385
386
388
3 91
378
379

COVER: Sunlight has long been taken for granted by the scientific community. But now the systematic study of the interactions of light with plants and animals is growing in scientific importance. See p. 386.

Publisher

E. G. Sherburne Jr.

Editor

Kendrick Frazier

Senior Editor and

Physical Sciences Dietrick E. Thomsen

Senior Editor and

Behavioral Sciences Robert J. Trotter Biological Sciences Joan Arehart-Treichel Science and Society John H. Douglas **Space Sciences** Jonathan Eberhart Writer/Copy Editor Lisa J. Shawver Art Director Dale Appleman Esther Gilgoff Assistant to the Editor

Books

Margit Friedrich

Advertising

Scherago Associates, Inc.

11 W. 42nd St. New York, N.Y. 10036 Fred W. Dieffenbach Sales Director

Copyright © 1974 by Science Service, Inc., 1719 N St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Republication of any portion of SCIENCE NEWS is strictly prohibited.

Subscription Department 231 West Center Stre Marion, Ohio 43302

Subscription rate: 1 yr., \$10; 2 yrs., \$18; 3 yrs., \$25. (Add \$2 a year for Canada and Mexico, \$3 for all other countries.) Change of address: Four to six weeks' notice is required. Please state exactly how magazine is to be addressed. Include zip code.

Printed in U.S.A. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C. Established as Science News Letter ® in mimeograph form March 13, 1922. Title registered as trademark U.S. and Canadian Patent Offices.

Published every Saturday by SCIENCE SER-VICE, Inc., 1719 N St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. (202-785-2255). Cable SCIENSERV.

To the Editor

Opposing views on plants

Re: Joan Arehart-Treichel's fine article on the private life of plants ("Off the Beat," SN: 5/18/74, p. 326). Some scientists have, by their own closed minds, cast upon all of us the reputation for the same. These men have become more like bishops and shrinks, who claim to have direct yet untraceable lines to the only truth. Exclusion by fiat of areas of investigation from the province of science is their most unpardonable offense. Under such circumstances, it is proper to reject the fiat and publish data outside the administrative mechanisms of "acceptable" science, such as these investigators have done.

Joanne Steele New York, N. Y.

I was surprised at the review of The Secret Life of Plants, which was given a full page space. If a publication like SCIENCE News is not going to call a spade a spade and label this nonsene as pure, unadulterated, junk-who is? It is not a question of whether or not one agrees with what they say. The problem is that the authors have no scientific training, do not know how to conduct an experiment, do not know what controls are, and give in no important case any reference by which the reader can check on their evidence and interpretations.

The reviewer says ". . . some of the techniques are zany." I defy her to quote me one which was rational. The whole book was a joke. It is part of a tidal wave of sheer, 100 percent, 14-karat, homogenous, anti-scientific garbage which is presently flooding the country.

Mortimer T. Cohen New York, N. Y.

Joan Arehart-Treichel's article on plant behavior was very heartwarming. However, I must agree with Arthur Galston of Yale University and many others of the scientific community that the belief that plants respond to human emotion is clearly unscientific, if not ridiculous.

First of all, the physiological make-up of plants is relatively elementary when compared to mammals. They have no nervous system of any kind which would seem necessary if plants are to carry on such complex behavior as emotion, personality, etc. Instead, plants have a system

of hormonal regulation carried on principally by substances called auxins. However, these plant hormones (which are only responsible for growth patterns) only institute their effect in response to stimuli of abiotic nature like gravity and light. They could hardly be expected to respond to such an intangible stimulus as human emotion. The problem involved is how this stimulus could be conveyed to the plants.

One may cite brain waves as a factor here. But, if this were the case, it would seem logical that plants would need more differentiated cells of even greater specialization to receive these waves and relay their message for a response. Unfortunately (for brain waves), plants have a greater proportion of unspecialized tissue than mammals, who have developed an efficient nervous system while plants have not.

Plants, with their many colors and forms, no doubt contribute much to the beauty of this earth. Nevertheless, I do believe that plant enthusiasts should have more knowledge of their plants' physiology before they try to treat them as pets, or even more lovingly as people.

Jerome Liebelson Spring Valley, N.Y.

Sorting out the credit

I was disturbed by Dietrick E. Thomsen's article entitled "Proteins and Metals Stick Together" (SN: 5/18/74, p. 324).

At the beginning of the article Thomsen quotes Ivar Giaever as saying: "There was no literature so I decided to find out myself." Then comes a description with diagrams of a typical experiment I have so often described in numerous articles published in the last few years: How a nickel-plated slide coated with bovine serum albumin adsorbs specifically homologous antibodies when dipped into an antiserum solution. Also, Christian Mathot and myself have already pointed to the potential usefulness of such a method for clinical applications.

The nice and original contribution of Giaever in this field is described towards the end of the article and is limited to the use of an indium-coated slide for estimating layer thickness.

It is most unfortunate that Giaever should have presented his work in such a manner that a reporter was led to believe that he, Giaever, is the author of the method for carrying out immunologic reactions at a liquid-solid interface.

Alexandre Rothen Rockefeller University New York, N.Y.

SCIENCE SERVICE

Institution for the Popularization of Science founded 1921; a nonprofit corporation

Institution for the Popularization of Science founded 1921; a nonprofit corporation

Board of Trustees—Nominated by the AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF

SCIENCE: Deborah P. Wolfe, Queens College of City University of New York; Bowen C. Dees,

The Franklin Institute; Athelstan Spilhaus, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Nominated by the NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES: Gerald F. Tape, Associated Universities;

Allen V. Astin, National Academy of Sciences; Glenn T. Seaborg (President), University of

California, Berkeley, Nominated by the NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL: Gerald Holton, Harvard

University; Joseph W. Berg Jr., National Research Council; Aaron Rosenthal, National Academy

of Sciences. Nominated by the JOURNALISTIC PROFESSION: Norman Cousins, "World"; Julius

Duscha, Washington Journalism Center; O. W. Riegel (Secretary), Washington and Lee University.

Nominated by E. W. SCRIPPS TRUST: Milton Harris (Treasurer), Washington, D.C.; Edward W.

Scripps II (Vice President and Chairman of the Executive Committee), Edward W. Scripps Trust;

John Troan, Pittsburgh Press.

Director: E. G. Sherburne Jr.; Assistant Director: Dorothy Schriver; Business Manager: Donald R. Harless; Things of Science: Ruby Yoshioka.

June 15, 1974