

## LETTERS

### Antibiotics: Use in Animal Feed

Thomas H. Jukes (Letters, 6 Apr., p. 8) accuses me of misrepresenting myself as having been "naïve" at the time I agreed to serve on the Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST) task force on antibiotics in feeds because an article on that subject appeared in the *Journal of Commerce* of 23 September 1977 under my name. If one views this accusation in the light of the actual sequence of events, of which it appears Jukes was aware (1), it becomes clear that Jukes' statement is wrong.

When I and several other plasmid biologists were approached by CAST in April 1977 and invited to serve on the task force, I was, indeed, naïve, never having heard of CAST and knowing no more about the use of antibiotics in feeds than that it was a common practice and that the Food and Drug Administration was involved in an attempt to curtail it.

Having accepted that responsibility, we naturally set about becoming better informed, an effort that required virtually the entire spring and summer (of 1977). Early in September 1977, I was invited to testify before the Senate subcommittee on agricultural research and general legislation (21-22 September 1977) on the subject of antibiotics in feeds. Since the work of the task force was not yet complete, I requested and received permission to testify from Virgil Hays, chairman of the task force. Shortly thereafter, the *Journal of Commerce* published (without my knowledge) an excerpt from my testimony, which is the substance of the article upon which Jukes' accusation is based.

Two other points in Jukes' letter deserve comment. Regarding a telephone call James McGinnis made to me, alluded to by Jukes (I wonder how he knew about that call), McGinnis furnished data demonstrating that one can compensate for substandard livestock feed by pumping the animals full of antibiotics. I had already sifted through masses of data on this subject showing that optimal livestock management practices can abolish the "growth-promoting" effects of feeding antibiotics; included in these data was a set of such results by Hays himself. I have strong misgivings about the waste of one of our most valuable medical resources as a cover for substandard practices in the rearing of livestock, even if it is sometimes effective and saves the time, money, and effort needed for decent animal management. Moreover, Jukes is now

advocating the use of drugs not for "growth promotion" but for wholesale antibacterial prophylaxis: "today's production of meat requires preventive medicine rather than treatment of sick animals" (2). Blind, "broad spectrum" prophylaxis has long been considered useless and dangerous in human medicine because it fosters the development of multiresistant bacteria; on the basis of bitter experience, some meat producers have finally come to the same conclusion.

With regard to chloramphenicol (Cm) and chlortetracycline (Tc), Jukes seems to be unfamiliar with the voluminous literature of the past 20 years on R factors, in which it has been found by practically everyone working in the field that one of the most common plasmid linkages is that between Cm and Tc resistances—so that the feeding of Tc automatically and with high frequency selects for bacteria that are resistant to Cm (and several other antibiotics) also.

Finally, in view of the ad hominem nature of Jukes' attack, I would have liked the opportunity to respond simultaneously.

RICHARD NOVICK

Department of Plasmid Biology,  
Public Health Research Institute  
of the City of New York, Inc.,  
455 First Avenue, New York 10016

#### References

1. T. H. Jukes, personal communication.
2. ———, *Anim. Nutr. Health* 32, 9 (1977).

### Food Safety Report

Media coverage of the recent National Academy of Sciences-Institute of Medicine food safety report, as might be expected, has been variable in accuracy and scope. Regretfully, R. Jeffrey Smith's extensive piece in the 23 March issue of *Science* (News and Comment, p. 1221) does not rank high in the spectrum of accuracy.

I shall limit myself to two comments, one minor but to which I can testify personally; a second major but which depends upon more careful reading of the committee majority consensus. Smith called me about the source of the report's recommendation of three qualitative levels of risk. I told him that my recollection of the complex discussions within the committee did not allow me to identify any single source. I said that I had been one of the proponents of the concept of a relatively few broadly defined levels of risk and that during discussion I had referred to the utility of the

concept with respect to recombinant DNA. I did *not* say that the committee's recommendation "was patterned on the different degrees of containment for recombinant DNA research," as stated by Smith. A passing remark in discussion is given far too much weight by that interpretation.

More consequential is the statement that the committee's recommendations "constitute a significant return to the philosophy of caveat emptor," a theme sounded in the subhead of the article in even bolder form. I do not recall that the philosophy in question was ever discussed within the committee and for good reason. Caveat emptor was a battle flag in an earlier era of controversy, when the issue was whether the federal government should intervene in any way on behalf of consumers. The issue as seen by the committee, in this era, was how the federal government could most intelligently and effectively intervene—taking into account different public interests, including those among consumers, and the increased complexity and changing nature of the technical information bearing upon decision. Rather than suggesting elimination of a federal role, the committee recommended wider discretion in the Food and Drug Administration's exercise of it, buttressed by more effective scientific input, more public information, and more widespread public participation. Caveat emptor? Perhaps—for the consumers of News and Comment in *Science* magazine.

CLIFFORD GROBSTEIN

Program in Science, Technology,  
and Public Affairs, University of  
California, San Diego, La Jolla 92093

### Recombinant DNA Experiments

I hope that DeWitt Stetten, Jr., has seen the irony that is implicit in his letter "rejoicing" in the report of the decrease in infectivity of polyoma virus DNA when recombined into plasmid or phage DNA and inserted into *Escherichia coli* (30 Mar., p. 1292). He mentions the "long-awaited report," but does not state that this report is not only long-awaited but is a cart-before-the-horse situation. Long after guidelines have been set up, we now have a report bearing directly on the experiments which *should* have been done before the guidelines were adopted. Is this not contrary to established scientific procedure? What we should rejoice about is that the experiment did not turn out the other way, which would have really highlighted the

blunder of setting up guidelines before the experiments indicating safety were performed and of not having a moratorium on this type of research before these experiments were performed. Considering the time-span of biological research, past, present, and future, would a year's delay really have made a difference?

PHILIP SIEKEVITZ

Rockefeller University,  
1230 York Avenue, New York 10021

## Grants and the "Track Record"

Lionel F. Jaffe (Letters, 30 Mar., p. 1292) offers a practical suggestion for a specific reform in the grants mechanism which might substantially reduce the time wasted in grant preparation and review. He suggests that the applications of established investigators (perhaps at their option) be judged on recent performance and productivity rather than on a proposal. This suggestion has great merit.

Although the recent publication record is often considered in the study section review process, it is currently considered only as an indication of the applicant's ability to carry out the proposed studies; it is the proposal itself that is at the focus of the evaluation. I believe it would not be hard to document the fact that, in the case of senior investigators, the recent "track record" is the single most reliable indicator of probable future performance. Perhaps what is needed is an objective analysis of the value of the record as a predictor of performance. If it is as good as I intuit, study sections could then be instructed to give the record the weight it is due and senior investigators would be able to spend more time on their research and less on the writing of their applications.

RICHMOND T. PREHN

Jackson Laboratory,  
Bar Harbor, Maine 04609

## Tea with Milk

The letter by Wheeler of Thomas J. Lipton, Inc., (6 Apr., p. 6) stoutly defending tea as containing no "tannic acid" leaves some things unsaid. I think I should supply the missing information: what characterizes tea, and what is manipulated by time of plucking, blending, and so forth, to achieve the desired degree of "briskness," is certainly not hydrolyzable tannin but condensed catechin tannin.

The deleterious aspects of condensed catechin tannin are becoming increasingly apparent to nutritionists (1) and to scientists engaged in cancer research (2). This class of tannin is prominent in the betel nut (*Areca catechu*), which has for many years been linked to high rates of oral and esophageal cancer in India and in Durban, South Africa (3); and tumors occurred in 100 percent of experimental rats that received subcutaneous injections of the tannin fraction from betel nuts (4). The tannin fraction from tea was also tested, and tumors occurred in 26 out of 30 animals (5).

Segi has reported an impressive correlation between the habitual consumption of tea-rice gruel and the areas of high incidence of esophageal cancer in Japan (6). Thanks to early warnings from the British Medical Association, the British have traditionally added milk to their tea to bind the tannin. The Dutch do not and, in the mid-18th century, when tea was the national drink of Holland, that

country had an alarming level of "obstructed swallowing into the oesophagus." When the Dutch switched from tea to coffee, the disease became rare (3). There is strong epidemiological evidence, together with results of bioassays, linking folk-remedy plants high in catechin tannin with high rates of esophageal cancer in other populations (7).

JULIA F. MORTON

Morton Collectanea,  
P.O. Box 248204, University of Miami,  
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

## References

1. M. L. Price, L. G. Butler, W. R. Featherston, J. C. Rogler, *Nutr. Rep. Int.* **17**, 229 (1978); M. L. Price, L. G. Butler, J. C. Rogler, W. R. Featherston, *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, in press.
2. J. F. Morton, in *Toxicology and Occupational Medicine*, W. Deichman, Ed. (Elsevier, North-Holland, New York, 1979), pp. 129-137.
3. —, *Q. J. Crude Drug Res.* **12**, 1829 (1972).
4. G. J. Kapadia, E. B. Chung, B. Ghosh, Y. N. Shukla, S. P. Basak, J. F. Morton, *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* **60**, 683 (1978).
5. G. J. Kapadia, B. D. Paul, E. B. Chung, B. Ghosh, S. N. P. Radhan, *ibid.* **57**, 207 (1976).
6. M. Segi, *Gann* **66**, 199 (1975).
7. J. F. Morton, *Econ. Bot.* **32**, 111 (1978).

**Erratum:** In the News and Comment article about assessing the damage resulting from the accident at the Three Mile Island nuclear plant (11 May, p. 594), the last paragraph contains the statement that plant shutdowns ordered earlier this year by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission involved nuclear reactors built by Babcock & Wilcox. That statement was incorrect. The earlier shutdowns did not involve Babcock & Wilcox reactors.

**Erratum:** The second sentence in reference 2 of the letter from Holdren, Smith, and Morris (11 May, p. 564) was incorrect. It should have read "AECB 1119 contains 30 citations to this report [by Smith, Weyant, and Holdren], 13 direct ones plus 17 more. . . ."

**Erratum:** In the report, "Dynamic chemical equilibrium in a polar desert pond: A sensitive index of meteorological cycles," by H. J. H. Harris *et al.* (20 Apr., p. 301), the key shown in Fig. 2B was in error. The correct figure is shown below.

