

American Association for the Advancement of Science

Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Publisher: J. Thomas Ratchford, *Acting*

Editor: Daniel E. Koshland, Jr.

Deputy Editors: Philip H. Abelson (*Engineering and Applied Sciences*); John I. Brauman (*Physical Sciences*)

EDITORIAL STAFF

Managing Editor: Patricia A. Morgan

Assistant Managing Editors: Nancy J. Hartnagel, John E. Ringle

Senior Editors: Eleanore Butz, Ruth Kulstad

Associate Editors: Martha Collins, Barbara Jasny, Katrina L. Kelner, Edith Meyers, Phillip D. Szurmi, David F. Voss

Letters Editor: Christine Gilbert

Book Reviews: Katherine Livingston, *editor*; Deborah F. Washburn

This Week in Science: Ruth Levy Guyer

Chief Production Editor: Ellen E. Murphy

Editing Department: Lois Schmitt, *head*; Mary McDaniel, Barbara E. Patterson

Copy Desk: Lyle L. Green, Sharon Ryan, Beverly Shields, Anna Victoreen

Production Manager: Karen Schools

Graphics and Production: Holly Bishop, Kathleen Cosimano, Eleanor Warner

Covers Editor: Grayce Finger

Manuscript Systems Analyst: William Carter

NEWS STAFF

News Editor: Barbara J. Culliton

News and Comment: Colin Norman, *deputy editor*; Mark H. Crawford, Constance Holden, Eliot Marshall, Marjorie Sun, John Walsh

Research News: Roger Lewin, *deputy editor*; Deborah M. Barnes, Richard A. Kerr, Gina Kolata, Jean L. Marx, Arthur L. Robinson, M. Mitchell Waldrop

European Correspondent: David Dickson

BUSINESS STAFF

Associate Publisher: William M. Miller, III

Business Staff Manager: Deborah Rivera-Wienhold

Membership Recruitment: Gwendolyn Huddle

Member and Subscription Records: Ann Ragland

Guide to Biotechnology Products and Instruments: Shauna S. Roberts

ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVES

Director: Earl J. Scherago

Production Manager: Donna Rivera

Advertising Sales Manager: Richard L. Charles

Marketing Manager: Herbert L. Burklund

Sales: New York, NY 10036: J. Kevin Henebry, 1515 Broadway (212-730-1050); Scotch Plains, NJ 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); Chicago, IL 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-337-4973); San Jose, CA 95112: Bob Brindley, 310 S. 16 St. (408-998-4690); Dorset, VT 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581); Damascus, MD 20872: Rick Sommer, 24808 Shrubbery Hill Ct. (301-972-9270); U.K., Europe: Nicholas Jones, +44(0647)52918.

Instructions for contributors appears on page xi of the 27 March 1987 issue. Editorial correspondence, including requests for permission to reprint and reprint orders, should be sent to 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005. Telephone: 202-326-6500.

Advertising correspondence should be sent to Tenth Floor, 1515 Broadway, NY 10036. Telephone 212-730-1050 or WU Telex 968082 SCHERAGO.

The Case for Qualifying "Case by Case"

A recurring theme in discussions of governmental oversight of "deliberate releases" of genetically engineered organisms concerns precisely what classes of organisms should be regulated. The experiments "captured" by governmental regulation should be only those that are necessary and sufficient to protect human health and the environment. Related to this theme is the phrase "case by case," as in "ensure that recombinant DNA organisms are evaluated for potential risk, prior to applications in agriculture and the environment by means of an independent review of potential risks on a case-by-case basis."* The concept of case-by-case evaluation of proposed field trials by national authorities is widely touted and has become something of a totem, inspiring much reverence but little reflection. Evaluation of each and every proposed field trial would be contrary to accepted practice, debilitating to academia and to industry, and an unnecessary burden to government.

In the quotation above, from a recently published Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development document, case by case was carefully qualified to mean specifically "an individual review of a proposal against assessment criteria which are relevant to the particular proposal; this is not intended to imply that every case will require review by a national or other authority since various classes of proposals may be excluded." Thus, in current practice, an investigator contemplating a field trial reviews, or compares, the various aspects of his experiment with relevant assessment criteria to determine whether prior governmental approval is required. For example, if the experiment were a field test of ore extraction by an indigenous *Thiobacillus* manipulated with recombinant DNA techniques in order to delete a gene, the review performed by the investigator would reveal that both the National Institutes of Health Guidelines and the relevant Environmental Protection Agency regulations (under the Toxic Substances Control Act) exempt the experiment from prior approval.

The OECD qualification of case by case underscores the important principle that categories of products entailing negligible or trivial risk may be defined so as not to require special governmental scrutiny or restriction; these could range from narrow products (for example, an inclusive list of such organisms as *Pseudomonas syringae*, *Bacillus thuringiensis*, and *Thiobacillus ferrooxidans*, manipulated by self-cloning) to broad ones (for example, all well-characterized nonpathogens). This principle of exemption of low-risk categories is, after all, nothing new: more than 90 percent of recombinant DNA laboratory experiments potentially under the jurisdiction of the NIH guidelines have been exempted completely, and the NIH Recombinant DNA Advisory Committee has begun to create categorical exemptions from the definition of "deliberate release."

Perhaps the most compelling argument for a qualified definition of case by case is the extraordinary safety record of field testing of live microbial pesticides that, until recently, could occur unencumbered by federal regulation. At least 13 organisms, approved and registered with EPA, are marketed in dozens of different products.† All of these (as well as numerous other unsuccessful candidates, undoubtedly) were developed and field tested safely without regulatory oversight, because field trials on less than 10 acres were then exempt from the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, the pesticide statute.

Consider, in addition, the monumental successes of pre-recombinant DNA genetic engineering of "deliberately released" products such as high-lysine corn, disease-resistant wheat, and genetic hybrids such as tangelos, beefaloos, and a vast array of flowers. Should every field trial of a new variety of these require the imprimatur of the federal government? Should the use of recombinant DNA techniques per se to effect a genetic change determine the need for federal oversight? Obviously not, but one might well wonder, hearing the uncritical clamor for "case-by-case" approvals of all "deliberate releases."—HENRY I. MILLER, *Special Assistant to the Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, Rockville, MD 20857*

*Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, *Recombinant DNA Safety Considerations* (Paris, France, 1986). †F. Betz, M. Levin, M. Rogul, *Recomb. DNA Tech. Bull.* 6, 135 (1983).