vivisection detailed my firsthand experiences as a disability and animal rights advocate. Far from defending disease, my presentation examined how scare tactics that play on people's fears about illness are often used to promote further experimentation on nonhuman animals.

Lawrence Carter-Long
Coalition for Research Ethics and Accountability,
Post Office Box 11395,
Albuquerque, NM 87192–0395, USA
E-mail: stopitri@aol.com

■

German Society and German Science

In his editorial of 10 May (p. 791), Hubert Markl criticizes "a vocal part of German society" that has been hostile to nuclear technology and biotechnology, "driving billions of marks worth of high-tech investment abroad." I think these people legitimately struggle to direct scientific and technological enterprises for the benefit of mankind.

At present, science is not being recognized as a benefit. Chernobyl is an ongoing nightmare. The predicted economic benefit of nuclear energy—to make the Sahara green and to change the North Pole into the Riviera—has all but vanished. This was made plain in the early 1990s, when the then British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher removed nuclear power from the electricity-privatization package in order to make privatization viable.

And what about biotechnology? A prominent achievement of genetic engineering is associated with the junkie asthetics of injecting cows with growth hormones for increased efficiency in milk production. A major goal is associated with the equally drug-fiendish mentality of making crops resistant to industrial pesticides. Voices like that of Germany's former Liberal Democratic Secretary of State Hans-Dietrich Genscher have endorsed the conciliatory side of biotechnology: that it allows manufacturing of better products by ecologically benign processes. Is this direction of biotechnology politically inopportune? If the controversy in Germany about genetic engineering seems bizarre, that's because it is. Scientists should stay out of it.

Thomas R. Garbe
Department of Microbiology,
University of Texas Health Science Center,
San Antonio, TX 78284–7758, USA

Fetal Immune Response

The recent demonstration—by three different groups using distinct experimental approaches—that immunization during the neonatal period leads to vigorous and protective immune response rather than to tolerance is of major significance for immunologists, but most important, it opens for clinicians new horizons regarding vaccination (Reports, 22 Mar., pp. 1723, 1726, and 1728). These studies, performed with neonatal mice, are in keeping with earlier observations in human studies that maternal vaccination with tetanus toxoid (TT) during the last trimester of gestation induced active in utero immunization of the offspring. The umbilical cord blood of such newborns contained immunoglobulin M (IgM) antibodies against TT (IgM does not cross human placenta), and children born to mothers vaccinated during pregnancy displayed an enhanced anti-TT response to the classical DPT vaccination program (*1*). Given that maternal immunoglobulin G (IgG) crosses the placenta, it was not possible to determine whether in utero immunization led to the production of IgG antibodies. However, immunoglobulin E (IgE) anti-TT antibodies were detected in a significant proportion