

## Reassignment of Gymnomycota

Whittaker's five-kingdom classification (1) of living organisms is possibly the most satisfactory yet proposed. It should provide not only a more sensible system of classification but also a more logical means of presenting this subject to students.

With the object of strengthening rather than criticizing the proposal, I recommend an alteration in treatment of a group with which I am familiar. The change would be in line with Whittaker's emphasis on mode of nutrition. It is unlikely that any members of the subkingdom Gymnomycota, which (excepting labyrinthulids) ingest their food, are related to what are commonly considered the true fungi, which have absorptive nutrition. Therefore, I suggest that this group be transferred to the kingdom Protista, possibly as a subkingdom, with the bulk of the protists in a separate subkingdom. It might then be expedient, at least tentatively, to include the plasmodiophorids and protomyxids (plasmodial forms living in the cells of other organisms) in the Gymnomycota. The latter are known to ingest, and there is evidence that the former may ingest as well as absorb their nutrients.

Whittaker's statement that his three phyla of Gymnomycota have probably had three separate phylogenetic origins is not supported by our recent findings (2) on a still simpler and more primitive group, the protostelids, which are clearly allied with the Gymnomycota. Evidence has been presented in support of the origin of a major portion of the cellular slime molds from the protostelids, and there is also a fair possibility that plasmodial slime molds may have had their origin in this group. In addition, there are reasons for believing that the cellular slime molds are not a monophyletic group (3).

Finally, there are probably more forceful arguments for allying the hyphochytrids, which have absorptive nutrition, with the aquatic fungi rather than the protists. Though their origin may have been independent of other groups of fungi, a good case can be made for their derivation from the laterally biflagellate fungi (Oomycota) through loss of the posterior flagellum.

LINDSAY S. OLIVE

Department of Botany,  
University of North Carolina,  
Chapel Hill 27514

## References

1. R. H. Whittaker, *Science* 163, 150 (1969).
2. L. S. Olive, *Mycologia* 59, 1 (1967).
3. ———, *Amer. J. Bot.* 52, 513 (1965).

21 January 1969

I consider Dr. Olive's suggested treatment of the Gymnomycota as a subkingdom of the Protista an acceptable alternative to my own arrangement. The mittenlike form of the kingdom Fungi in one of my figures is intentional: in my classification and some others the slime molds stick out like a sore thumb. There are, necessarily, other questions on my classification of the fungi; among these questions are the separation of the hyphochytrids from other fungi mentioned by Dr. Olive and the degree of evolutionary separation implied for the subkingdoms Dimastigomycota and Eumycota. I feel my treatment of the fungi is reasonable but by no means definitive, and I shall watch with interest for the conclusions the mycologists themselves reach from considering classification of fungi in contexts different from the traditional plant kingdom.

R. H. WHITTAKER

Section of Ecology and Systematics,  
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

2 April 1969

## Visual Form Discrimination on the Basis of Relative Distribution of Light

Winans (1) has reported that cats with lesions of the visual cortex can discriminate inverted from upright triangles but has cautioned that her subjects may have responded to the spatial distribution of light rather than to the form of the stimuli per se. Dodwell and Freedman (2) have reiterated this possible interpretation but offer no relevant data. Nor are there pertinent observations in the classical literature (3). In the course of a study unrelated to this question I have recorded some data with normal rats which suggest that a triangle discrimination based on spatial distribution of luminous flux is quite possible.

Eight rats which had previously learned to avoid shock by choosing either an inverted or an upright white triangle on a black background were given a free choice on ten consecutive trials between the same forms but with black and white areas interchanged; that is, they chose between an inverted

and an upright black triangle on a white background. The triangle forms were shifted from one side of the choice point to the other according to a modified Gellerman (4) series. This was accomplished by rotating the stimulus cards 180° so that choice on the basis of olfactory cues from earlier choices is unlikely.

Note that the same forms (for example, upright white and upright black triangles) have opposite flux gradients from top to bottom, while opposite forms (for example, upright white and inverted black triangles) are similar in this respect. If the original discrimination were mainly on the basis of form, one would expect the animal to choose the new stimulus having within it the precise contours of the previously positive stimulus, oriented the same way (for example, going from an upright white triangle to an upright black triangle). If the original discrimination were mainly on the basis of relative distribution of light, one would expect the animal to disregard the contour and orientation cues and choose the stimulus with similar black-white gradients (for example, going from an upright white triangle to an inverted black triangle).

The data support the latter hypothesis. Seventy-three of the 80 possible choices were to the opposite form. This preference is statistically different from random choice ( $\chi^2 = 29$ , d.f. = 1;  $P < .001$ ). All animals chose the opposite form on at least seven of the ten trials and half the subjects chose it every time. Figure 1 shows the percent of choices to each transfer stimulus from the original training stimuli.

Although one cannot conclude from these results with rats that Winans' cats were discriminating on the basis of spatial distribution of light, the pos-




Fig. 1. Percent of choices to each transfer stimulus from the original training stimuli.

# Science

## Reassignment of Gymnomycota

Lindsay S. Olive and R. H. Whittaker

*Science* **164** (3881), 857.  
DOI: 10.1126/science.164.3881.857

ARTICLE TOOLS <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/164/3881/857.1.citation>

PERMISSIONS <http://www.sciencemag.org/help/reprints-and-permissions>

Use of this article is subject to the [Terms of Service](#)

---

*Science* (print ISSN 0036-8075; online ISSN 1095-9203) is published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1200 New York Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20005. The title *Science* is a registered trademark of AAAS.

Copyright © 1969 The Authors, some rights reserved; exclusive licensee American Association for the Advancement of Science. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.