

Dr Roll-Hansen

MAR 20 1981

Mendel.

Thank you for your interesting
& generous response to my letter.
Reprints. ... →

I also appreciate
Morgan's statement
that "inter-
segregation".

Remarkably a rather similar
ideology impeded the development
of bacterial genetics - cf. Hinsel-
wood's "Chemical Kinetics of the
Bacterial Cell", and I believe even
Max Delbrück never quite escaped
entanglement by such alluring
physicist-like abstract models.

—

Meanwhile, Alexander Weinstein,
has located the passage I was
scouting (see enccl.) I do not know
what would substantiate this assump-
tion: Nageli's papers would be a
reasonable place to look, but don't
know what is extant.

Pasteur

May I ask your attention to another
matter. For some time I have been
fascinated by the degree to which
Dauvin and Pasteur ignored each
other. I endorse the only mutual refer-
ences I have been able to find.

- As I note you have specialized in
Pasteur, I wonder if you can add to
this?

An even more fundamental issue:
Can you comment on Pasteur's
position in re monomorphous as
enunciated by Cohn & Koch? How did
personal and national rivalry influ-
ence the development of scientific
doctrine in this field?

I am sure you will understand my
preoccupation with these questions.

Sincerely,

John Dowling

P.S. - Reductionism

To answer Mayr 1968 : much
of the development of molecular and
microbial genetics after 1944
surely must be called reductionist:
e.g. the successful search for genetic
recombination in bacteria
the selection theory of adaptation
(drug resistance)
the selective theory of antibody
formation
the mechanisms of DNA
replication (Kornberg).

Not so are the discovery of the
role of DNA in genetic trans-
formation (C Griffith - Avery)

Transduction in bacteria

(recent)
nor the vast majority of practical
discoveries in immunology and
medicine. (sic!)

With respect to the latter, I
believe we are on the point of a new
cycle of rather reductionist approaches,
symbolized by the rising "DNA
engineering" technologies.