

/CORRESPONDENCE

European Opposition

To the editor:

A brief note to indicate my concern about the title of your recent article, "Who's Who in European Antibiotech" (*BioTechnology* 11:44, January).

While your article implies that some of the "green" organizations now take a fairly balanced view of biotechnology and that many views are moderating-- "giving way to a readiness to communicate with those already using genetic manipulation"--the title of the article implies that all the organizations are antibiotech. This is very unfortunate because many are not antibiotech per se. But they may become so if they are so accused.

I do hope that you can persuade whoever is responsible for the titles of articles in *BioTechnology* to write an apology to the more moderate groups mentioned in the article or better still to write an explanation in *BioTechnology*. We certainly don't need *BioTechnology* to help promote opposition to biotechnology.

June N. Grindley Medea International Healthcare Consulting 29 Packhorse Lane, Matcham Oxon OX13 ENT, U.K.

June N. Grindley Medea

International Healthcare Consulting

29 Packhorse Lane, Matcham Oxon OX13 ENT, U.K.

To the editor:

While Bernard Dixon's article "Who's Who in European Antibiotech" (*BioTechnology* 11:44, January) provides an interesting overview of those pressure groups campaigning on biotechnology in Europe, the article omits to mention the two most active animal rights organizations campaigning on this issue in the U.K.

The British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV) is the U.K.'s leading organization campaigning to end the use of animal experimentation. It uses all peaceful means to persuade the public, politicians, and opinion-formers of the moral and scientific arguments against vivisection. Compassion In World Farming (CIWF) leads the campaign in the U.K. for an end to the factory farming of animals. Between them the two organizations represent some 25,000 members. Both are funded entirely through public donations and support.

In October 1992 BUAV and CIWF co-sponsored an international conference on animal biotechnology organized by CIWF's educational arm, the Athene Trust.

On 12 January 1993, BUAV and CIWF filed a formal opposition to the granting of a European Patent

in the Harvard Oncomouse case. The BUAV/CIWF opposition is being supported by a coalition of 28 animal protection groups from 12 European countries. If the opposition is successful the Oncomouse patent will have to be revoked.

The BUAV and CIWF are calling for a ban on animal patenting and a moratorium on the genetic engineering of animals. Copies of the BUAV/CIWF Oncomouse opposition document are available from BUAV.

Malcolm Eames

*Head of Information and Research
BUAV 16a Crane Grove
London N7 8LB United Kingdom*

To the editor:

You wrote in the article "Who's Who in European Antibiotech" (*BioTechnology* 11:44, January) that the Institute for Social Research, Hamburg, is sponsored by Reetsma company, a cigarette producer. This is not correct. The Hamburger Institut für Sozialforschung is legally and financially an independent institute. The Hamburger Institut für Sozialforschung is a private foundation established in 1984. Its current research projects concentrate on the following areas: The role of violence in the development of civilization; the formation of West Germany; science and criticism; and nationalism, ethnicity, and racism.

If you have any questions about the institute, please contact:

Dagmar von Hoff

*Institute for Social Research
Public Relations
Mittelweg 36
2000 Hamburg 20
Germany*

Patent Concerns

To the editor:

I read the article (*BioTechnology* 11: 143, February) regarding reexamination of U.S. patent No. 4,503,035, of which I am one of the two co-inventors. This article includes the terms "bad faith," "misrepresentation," "patent fraud," and "invalid patent claims" in conjunction with the above patent. Although patent lawyers with whom I consulted assured me that the allegations are against Hoffman-LaRoche and not against the inventors, it is quite possible that my colleagues who are not legal experts may conclude from this article that I am accused of misconduct. I think that Jeffrey Fox had to specifically mention in the article that none of the allegations are against the inventors. However I will appreciate it very much if you will provide such a clarification in the next issue of *BioTechnology* in an appropriate form and space.

Menachem Rubinstein

*Associate Professor
Weizman Institute of Science
Rehovot
76100 Israel*

IMAGE
UNAVAILABLE
FOR COPYRIGHT
REASONS

*"Well,
Gottfried,
news from
the cloning
front,
I see!"*