

LETTERS

Deep-Sea Drilling

Deborah Shapley's report "Law of the sea meeting: A wet blanket for ocean research" (News and Comment, 14 Sept., p. 1024) was most interesting but told only part of the story.

The spokesmen for the American scientific community have weakened their prospects for a sensible regime for ocean research by their insistence on unlimited freedom. There is nothing sacrosanct about a research vessel. It is just as capable of polluting the seas or creating a hazard to navigation as any ordinary vessel. Moreover, the Glomar Challenger has demonstrated a capability to reenter the drill hole in the ocean floor with fresh drill bits that would enable it to strike oil or gas in deep waters. At the same time it has no capability to prevent blowouts comparable to that required of commercial operators. This means that a research vessel could possibly cause a blowout of such disastrous proportions as to pale the Santa Barbara blowout by comparison. Yet, the spokesmen for the American scientific community have persisted in their quest for total freedom from coastal nation control over scientific research beyond a narrow territorial sea.

The U.S. government, in its initial position in the United Nations Seabed Committee, went along with this view and worded its proposed draft of an international seabed treaty of 3 August 1970 accordingly. One need only visualize the reaction of the good citizens of Santa Barbara to word from Washington that neither the federal government nor their own local or state government had any power whatever to prevent a foreign counterpart of the Glomar Challenger from proceeding with a deep-sea drilling experiment in the Santa Barbara Channel just beyond the 12-mile limit to appreciate that this position had to be modified—as the U.S. delegation has now done-in the light of our own national interest and that of other coastal nations.

The 1958 Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf, in a clause incorporated into article 5 of the treaty, reportedly with the active support of the United States, prescribes that

8. The consent of the coastal State shall be obtained in respect of any research concerning the continental shelf and undertaken there. Nevertheless, the coastal State shall not normally withhold its consent if the request is submitted by a qualified in-

stitution with a view to purely scientific research into the physical or biological characteristics of the continental shelf, subject to the proviso that the coastal State shall have the right, if it so desires, to participate or to be represented in the research, and that in any event the results shall be published.

The scientific community has, at times, admittedly had serious difficulties obtaining the consent required by this clause or the comparable consent required by nonadherents to the Geneva convention under customary international law. These difficulties provide a solid basis for seeking meaningful modification of the quoted language. They do not, however, provide a basis for its complete elimination.

The American Bar Association (ABA) has taken a constructive approach to this important problem in the resolution on the natural resources of the sea adopted at its last annual meeting on 6 August 1973. In the portion of this resolution dealing with scientific research, the ABA

(12) SUPPORTS the general principle of freedom of scientific research, but recognizes the right of coastal States, within internationally agreed guidelines designed to provide the maximum practicable application of this principle, to impose reasonable restrictions on activities on their continental margins which will entail threats to their national security or hazards to the environment, as by drilling into the seabed.

The end result of the international negotiations now under way is much more likely to be palatable to the American scientific community if its spokesmen will support this sensible approach to the problem and work with the U.S. delegation for its effective implementation

LUKE W. FINLAY

224 East 50 Street, New York 10022

Nitrites in Foods

A. E. Wasserman and I. A. Wolff, who discuss the use of nitrate in their reply to P. H. Schuck and H. Wellford (Letters, 29 June, p. 1322), do not deal adequately with the question of the use of nitrite in cured meat and fish products, which Schuck and Wellford suggest is an unnecessary hazard to health. Wasserman and Wolff also ignore the problem of formation of carcinogenic nitrosamines in vivo (1), which Schuck and Wellford address in their letter. It is this amply

demonstrated possibility which poses the greatest hazard to the public, and is the major reason for the proposal to eliminate nitrite from our food whenever possible.

A limit of 200 parts per million (ppm) of residual nitrite in food (meat) set in 1926 is arbitrary and has no scientific basis. The preservative effect depends on the amount of nitrite added to the food before processing (a minimum, so it is said, of 150 ppm). After processing, the residual nitrite can be, and often is, as little as 10 ppm in, for example, ham or canned luncheon meat. It is this residual nitrite which takes part in nitrosamine formation in vivo, and it would seem that an upper limit of 200 ppm is far higher than indicated by good manufacturing practice, and high enough to be a threat to health.

Wasserman and Wolff state that there is a long history of usage of nitrate (and, by implication, of nitrite) with apparent safety. This is an unwarranted conclusion, since cancer is a widespread and common affliction, the cause of which is unknown. Evidence is accumulating about the formation of nitrosamines from nitrite and secondary or tertiary amines (agrichemical residues, drugs, and so forth), both in food and in vivo, which suggests that nitrosamines formed in this way are a cause of cancer (2), perhaps the major one. If, as Wasserman and Wolff suggest, the avoidance of botulinus poisoning takes precedence over the possible carcinogenic hazard from nitrosamine formation, consistency would demand that food manufacturers add nitrite to all products in which a botulism hazard exists. One can assume that this is their recommendation for vichyssoise soup and processed mushrooms, large batches of which have been recalled in the past year or so because of the finding of Clostridium botulinum contamination in some samples. The feeding study of Van Logten et al. (3), cited by Wasserman and Wolff, is irrelevant, as the usually accepted practice in toxicology was not followed, namely the administration of greatly exaggerated doses (often 100 times or more the human exposure) to compensate for the small number of animals (180) in the experiment. The results of this 2year feeding test (in which nitrite was added to the meat), cannot possibly be extrapolated to the experience of millions of humans who might consume proportionate doses of nitrite for 50 years or more. Moreover, this experiment did not test the possibility of

Gel electrophoresis!

New Bio-Rad cell runs up to 40 samples simultaneously-and identically. It stands to reason. Running samples under identical conditions improves reproducibility . . . as Bio-Rad's new Model 220 Gel Electrophoresis Cell proves. This dual vertical slab unit lets you polymerize or electrophorese at the same controlled temperature. Several samples can be run in the same gel, producing sharp clear bands with no overlap. ☐ Another fea-

ture which helps

bring about excel-

lent results: Gel-form-

ing solution is fed from the

bottom of the unit, producing

bubble-free gels even with gradients.

Furthermore, both gels and equipment

stay neat and clean because there's

no need for grease or agar seals.

The Model 220 Cell provides the user with exceptional operating flexibility. It accommodates sample volumes from 25 to 1200 microliters; gel slabs can be formed in three

forming combs.
This easy-touse cell has
an easy-to-acquire price:
\$495. Bio-Rad
also supplies
complete gel
slab electrophoresis systems, including
cell, destainer,
power supply, and
electrophoresis purity reagents. (The latter

thicknesses and

there's a choice

of four sample-

mum results. Reagents are included with every system order.)
Ask for details on Model 220, the latest advance in reproducible electrophoresis.

are also essential for opti-

&BIO·RAD Laboratories

32nd & Griffin Avenue, Richmond, CA 94804, Phone (415) 234-4130 Also in Rockville Centre, N.Y.; London, England; Milan, Italy; Munich, Germany

Circle No. 85 on Readers' Service Card

Measure Calories

QUICKLY · ACCURATELY · CONVENIENTLY



with a fully automatic
PARR® Adiabatic Calorimeter

. . . and a PARR®

Digital Thermometer





Parr now offers a completely new oxygen bomb calorimeter for measuring the calorific or Btu value of coal, oil, jet fuels, foods and other solid or liquid samples.

A new solid-state automatic temperature controller eliminates all time consuming temperature adjustments, doubles the output and improves the repeatability in calorimetric tests.

A new Parr Digital Thermometer and Printer add speed, convenience and accuracy to any bomb calorimeter by displaying temperatures in bright, easily seen numbers readable to .001° C, and producing a printed record of all readings taken during a calorific test.

Ask for our latest calorimeter catalog.



PARR INSTRUMENT COMPANY

211 Fifty-Third St.

Moline, III. 61265

Telephone (309) 762-7716

CYTOLOGISTS:

now prepare more slides in less time, with less fluid

The Shandon Cytospin cyto-centrifuge employs a unique cell concentrating and distributing technique permitting you to prepare a large quantity of microscope slides using a smaller amount of human blood plasma,



synovial fluid, peritoneal exudates, seminal or other body fluids. Centrifugation and slide preparation are performed simultaneously, which eliminates prior centrifugation and saves you time. Improved head design ensures safety when working with pathogenic organisms.

The Shandon Cytospin cyto-centrifuge produces a monolayer of cells and does not damage individual cell structure. Also, processed slides can be rapidly scanned using a preset high power objective without adjustment between slides. Get the catalog covering Cytospin and other outstanding Shandon-Elliott laboratory equipment . . . write Shandon Southern Instruments, Inc., 515 Broad Street, Sewickley, Pa. 15143 (Pittsburgh District).



Circle No. 83 on Readers' Service Card

"A selection of the chapters should be required reading among sociologists, historians and scientists."—Minerva

The Sociology of Science

ROBERT K. MERTON

"The exploration of the social conditions that facilitate or retard the search for scientific knowledge has been the major theme of Robert K. Merton's work for 40 years. This collection of papers, selected with unerring discrimination and provided with a most useful introduction by Norman W. Storer, represents a fascinating overview of this sustained inquiry. -Joseph Ben-David, The New York Times Book Review \$12.50

University of

Circle No. 100 on Readers' Service Card

Research for the **World Food Crisis**

"... there is no equivalent collection of the separate contributions of plant science, animal science, soil science, and agricultural engineering to the phenomenal increases in post-World War II agricultural productiv-'---American Scientist, January-February 1972, p. 91.

Edited by Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr. 320 pages. 25 illustrations. 31 tables. Index. Retail price: \$12.50. AAAS member price when payment is sent with order: \$10. ISBN 087168-092-0.

Arid Lands in Transition

Scientists from 14 countries assess the changing conditions, the potential for development and possible solutions to problems of development of arid regions in 15 countries around the world.

Edited by Harold E. Dregne. 524 pages. 120 illustrations, 5 maps. Index. Retail price: \$15.75. AAAS member price when payment is sent with order: \$13.50. ISBN 087168-090-4.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION for the ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE 1515 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 formation of nitrosamines in the stom-

Wasserman and Wolff state that there is no correlation of the amounts of nitrosamines that might be ingested under normal conditions with development of harmful effects, in man or animals. I draw their attention to the philosophy behind the Delaney Amendment-any amount of a known carcinogen is a hazard. To talk of the potential hazard of nitrosamines found in food is obfuscation, since these are carcinogens several orders of magnitude more potent than aminotriazole or cyclamates, which have been banned by the government. The benefit of the doubt should be given to the public rather than to the food processors. Surely it is time that nitrites (and nitrates) were removed from the GRAS (generally regarded as safe) list, as were cyclamates, until such time as they are proved safe for human consumption beyond a reasonable doubt.

W. LIJINSKY

Biology Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

References

- W. Lijinsky and S. S. Epstein, *Nature (Lond.)* 225, 21 (1970).
 W. Lijinsky, H. W. Taylor, C. Snyder, P. Nettesheim, *ibid.* 224, 176 (1973).
- M. J. Van Logten, E. M. den Tonkelaar, P. Kroes, J. M. Berkvens, G. J. van Esch, Food Cosmet. Toxicol. 10, 475 (1972).

Journal Evaluation

Garfield, in his empirical study "Citation analysis as a tool in journal evaluation" (3 Nov. 1972, p. 471) compares Solid State Physics, Immunology, Journal of Experimental Analysis of Behavior, Chemical Review, and other journals with small intersections of common interest. This seems strange, but acceptable, as long as the data are used carefully. However, because I wondered why there were no general geology journals listed in the 152 most frequently cited journals ranked by impact factor (figure 8, p. 477), I talked to a science and technology librarian and was struck with the potential for misuse of this article. Garfield's study can, and probably will, be misused by library administrators who want to cut back on periodicals. After all, Garfield does say (p. 474), "It is apparent, even from the makeup of this partial listing, that a good multi-