October 3, 1955

Mr. Dael Wolfle
Administrative Secretary
Science
1515 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington 5, D.C.

Dear Mr. Wolfle:

Thank you for your message of September 29. I have taken the opportunity to make some revisions along the lines suggested; I hope they will help to clarify the issues.

I hope this letter is not going to be taken as a rebuttal in a polemic debate. I realize that a report on an isolated article cannot take the time to cover all sides; it may not have been realized that the interpretations here were controversial. Indeed, I am willing to concede that the claims of Jacob and Wollman are correct, as concerns the effect of mechanical disruption, but I feel there is also some possibility of one or more alternative interpretations. My letter should help to complete the picture.

It is suggested that the news report is not an "editorial". It may help to minimize some readers' confusion on this point (including mine) if it were more definitely indicated what was quotation and what was the reviewer's viewpoint. If nothing else, the prefatory remarks by MHA show that both are represented. For this reason, I would save the adverb "editorially" in the 1st. sentence.

I had hoped that Dr. Glass would give me the benefit of his own advice on the letter, which is why I sent it through him. It might have been more appropriate to send it directly to you, and I assume I should continue any correspondence with yourself, accordingly.

Yours sincerely,

Joshua Lederberg
Professor of Genetics

CC: MHA