

August 31, 1967

Friends, colleagues, and disparate genotypes.

Marshall Nirenberg did me the favor of providing the very best possible introduction to the remarks I would like to make tonight in the form of an editorial that appears over his signature in the 11 August issue of Science, and I would like to ask you to hear me first read that editorial. It's entitled "Will Society Be Prepared?"

see front

All of the foregoing is a quotation from Marshall W. Nirenberg.

I have quoted Dr. Nirenberg's remarks because they make a good stalking horse for some criticisms which I would like to offer, and not in the spirit of any kind of personal criticism of Dr. Nirenberg himself. I must say that in self defense, because his own accomplishments in this particular field are so vast and so well known that I would hardly dare to stand up against him in his absence without some sort of reminder that I may be exaggerating the import of his remarks, ~~and his further comment, and that this was a very brief statement of them,~~ and that further elaboration on his part might give a different interpretation than for the sake of discussion I choose to put upon them at the present time. Nevertheless, I think ^{his} ~~the~~ language ~~that he has used~~ will evoke a familiar chord ~~with many of you~~. I think there is a reaction of fright about man's control of his own destiny, in particular about the use of genetic as compared to other forms of biological intervention, and I think it is important that we succeed in achieving a realistic point of view about what we can do, what we should do, what is likely to come about, the kinds of information that we need to find for ourselves to lead indeed to the wisest possible application of these new kinds ~~of~~ of discovery. I will take a few of ^{my} ~~the~~ texts from these remarks, and comment on them.

The most awesome phrase, and I have heard it at least twice tonight, and hear it every day, and I use it myself on frequent occasions, is the reference to man's power to shape his own biological destiny. This is an awesome statement, and it is probably true, ^{but} ~~We must consider what it means, and~~ I'm not sure what it means. ^{Our} ~~I think the~~ central question about man's biological destiny is whether we will have a posterity able and willing to commend us for our foresight, intelligence and good will. Molecular genetics undoubtedly plays a role in the ultimate answer to this question. Even more do politics, military technology, and what we might call the religious aspects of ^{human} ~~our~~ culture generally. The way that we deal with Indian famine and with Chinese nuclear power may be even more relevant to whether there is a biological destiny of man on earth. We also know that that destiny is finite in any absolute sense of the term, either with respect to catastrophic accidents of our own making, or with respect to the long term future of the solar system, and unless we, for example, ^{colonize} ~~pollenize~~ and propagandize the universe, we do have a finite, ultimate destiny. I say these remarks in hopes of achieving a certain re-focus about the nature of the problems that we should be concerned about; if we look too far in the future we may overlook the beam in our own eye.

The phrase "the betterment of mankind" also offers many difficulties of reference in any circumstances, and particularly when we're talking in evolutionary terms, which is the framework in which I choose to interpret Dr. Nirenberg's remarks. I could ask whether it was for the betterment of apekind when pre-hominids left the trees and moved on the ground, and had arms available for the acquisition and inspection of objects. Will any intelligent species stop evolution; in the conservative attitude that change is likely to destroy the existing framework of the species? Will it insist on having a completely rational view of the events that concern the existence of future generations many years, centuries, millenia hence, ⁱⁿ ~~again~~ the framework, which we must judge any issues

that concern the evolution of our own kind. But if we do insist on that rational
possibly
outlook, how can we/anticipate the unknown social and technological milieu of
existence of such future generations? ^A The one principle that we can probably
find common ground on for all of us is to avoid rash irrevocability of the de-
cisions that we make. Unless the very existence of scientific thinking is
included in the ^{with} irrevocable ~~that~~ we might wish to/hold in order to avoid change,
no isolated experiments can be regarded as globally irrevocable steps. In
fact, they are indispensable for the wisdom needed to judge which institutions
should be set up. When Nirenberg ~~refers to~~ recommends that "when man becomes
capable of instructing his own cells he must refrain from doing so," I believe
we should translate that into "We should be very cautious" about instituting
of
social and political frameworks/change which constitute irrevocable steps for
the entire species". But these remarks could very easily be interpreted, and
^{mis-}
some of us might be misled into adopting a ~~formula~~ ^{point of view} that suggests that we not
undertake any isolated experiments whatsoever in an area so full of ~~mystique~~.
^{as}
~~in the case of~~ the genetic programming of human cells, ~~until~~ we can under-
stand all of the implications. How will we ever learn what these implications
might be if we never do any such experiments? ⁺ We must distinguish the rash
irrevocability of isolated events in other spheres ^{from} ~~as~~ those which would apply
to experimentation with single organisms of our own species. History tells
us that a nation infected with nuclear power has no choice but to use and
develop it in the existing context of world affairs. A single nuclear detonation
was an irrevocable event for the politics of our time. It is doubtful, but not
certain, that any nation would make quite such a threatening use of genetic
weapons, and they are likely to be less immediately impactful, and to have much
longer time scales than the physical ones, which will permit some possibility of
intervention in the ^{premature} social misapplication ~~in the premature social imposition~~ of
^{any}
~~the~~ single standard of biological control.

With respect to future developments, Dr. Nirenberg makes some remarks that I must characterize as imprecise. He refers to the synthesis of messages, and their possible use in programming ~~the~~ cells. Whether the messages are synthetic or natural, so long as they are calculatedly used, would seem to me to make very little difference. I think when we talk about programming cells, and talk about messages, we should inquire for some greater precision into just what kinds of messages we are talking about, and what impact they will have on respective organisms. And the harm is that language of this kind read by laymen, read by political leaders, read by religious leaders, may be misunderstood, that very important distinctions may be blurred, and that we may end up with significant restrictions on our sense of freedom of action and experimentation, which in turn, as I have already remarked, is what we must have if we are ever to achieve the kind of wisdom that has been alluded to. Some of these distinctions are with respect to somatic, vs. germinal effects of these messages. Are we talking about the now conventional messages of the messenger RNA (the means by which DNA transmits/information to the protein synthetic machinery) or are we talking about the message which is implicit in the DNA structure of the cell? And are we talking about somatic effects or germinal effects? In general somatic effects are highly personal. An RNA message that I may use for the repair of many of my own genetic defects is something that may help me live, but will surely die with me, and it is very difficult for me to distinguish the social relevance of the use of an RNA message for the remedy of such a defect in my own person from that of any other aspects of medicine, ~~and~~ in fact, many therapeutic agents are already involved in this kind of meddling with my somatic genetic programming. If, for example, according to most contemporary theories, I were to partake of the use of a hormone, its purpose is to elicit the calculated production of specific messages in certain of my cells in order to make protein synthesis occur in cells in which it otherwise would not. If I were a diabetic and could anti-

cipate the possibility of taking a single shot of the appropriate messenger
 RNA to reprogram the synthesis of insulin in some of my liver cells after my
 pancreas gave out, I think I might resent any blockage to my taking advantage
 of this on the vague grounds that this is in some general way a genetic message
 that we should refrain from using until we may know for sure whether it will
 ultimately be for the benefit of mankind. If we are to use that criterion, we
 should use the criterion with respect to every medical intervention for individual
 human betterment. ⁴ In fact, I think it must be stressed that the point of view
 which is implied in the presentation of this editorial runs counter to the funda-
 mental responsibilities of medicine! ~~The fundamental responsibility of medicine~~
~~is~~ the care of the individual patient. It is certainly the concern of the rest
 of the social milieu that the sum of ~~the~~ care of individual patients works to
 the benefit of the entire community, but a literal following out of the pre-
 scription that Dr. Nirenberg has presented would be the total stoppage of medical
 practice. ⁴ Now when we come to germinal effects, of course we must have some
 much clearer idea of what we're doing than might be the case with the personal
 intervention of somatic repair. If ⁴ ~~the~~ use of a medicament ~~on me~~ has an implica-
 tion not only on my health and my survival and my longevity, and my ability to
 perform, but also that of my progeny, then of course we would insist, ~~and I~~
~~think it would not require the comments of a molecular biologist to insist,~~
⁴ that we have a clearer idea of what we're up to. Here we are already guilty of
 some sins, I think most geneticists would deplore the sometimes careless use
 of anti-cancer agents, for example, that are known to cause chromosome breakage,
 and are known to cause mutations, sometimes possibly in patients who may still
 have progeny, and of course we have had a very necessary and very important
 furor about the indiscriminate use of radiation. If the reports about the
 breakage of chromosomes by LSD are correct, there might indeed be a very strong
 rationale for social control of the use of this agent, or for the compulsory

sterilization of individuals who insist on receiving LSD, because they may then
 be laying a basis for^a very severe penalty that society as a whole must adopt
 with respect to the increased incidence of congenital malformation in the next
 generation. Here again, I don't think this is what Nirenberg was driving at;
 if he was concerned primarily about genetic messages with germinal effect, I
 don't believe that either he or I would be that greatly exercised about the pos-
 sibility of some transgression in ~~some~~^{an} experimental context. The occurrence of
 an occasional individual whose genotype is other than it might have been ~~is~~ as
 a result of the use of genetic message of calculated composition ~~in~~^{at} some point
 in its formation just does not have that kind of social impact. Something ~~was~~^{It is}
~~was~~ to be cautious about, but it is a caution already within the framework of
 medicine as it is now practiced. [¶] A more precise statement of what I trust are
 his concerns would be a caution against the imposed social control of those
 techniques, those apparent benefits, those advances that molecular biology may
 help to bring about. And in this we have a certain analogy with rational
 germinal choice, as has been advocated by Huxley and Muller, for example, ~~and~~
[¶] Muller was constantly being misquoted with respect ~~with~~ to his advocacy of the
 use of the technique of artificial insemination of chosen donors. He had in mind
 individual choice of specific genotypes ~~as~~ as sources of sperm for the production
 of what he hoped might occasionally be superior kinds of individuals and he was
 constantly misinterpreted as advocating social imposition of such germinal choice
 on families that would have preferred to make their own mistakes rather than
 adopt those of the community in which they lived. ~~Now it is possible to argue,~~
~~and sometimes I have argued myself that~~[¶] that distinction isn't as easy as it
 might appear. The mere introduction of an attractive technique, of a technique
 which seems to confer a certain degree of social benefits, and which has unknown
 social hazards, may lead to its social adoption, ^bIf this is the problem, this
 is what ought to be stated, and this is what we should attack. I think, though,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

that most of us would agree that while isolated modifications of existing genotypes in either a random way, or in a calculated way, can increase the range of variability and sometimes bias the range of candidates for natural selection to operate, ~~that~~ the overwhelming source of man's biological destiny in the sense of the overwhelming basis of the changes in gene frequencies ~~are~~ the changes of the genotype of the human species come from our physical and cultural environment operating by natural selection; that differential reproduction is overwhelmingly a more important source of the definition of the next generation than any isolated changes in availability of individual genotypes.

Now Nirenberg says it has not ^{yet} been possible to program mammalian cells. That remark, strictly within the context of his statement, is correct. He was talking about the use of isolated DNA operating to replace mutant genes by other mutant genes or by normal alleles, by analogy with the well known pneumococcus transformation experiments. ~~I should remark that~~ (that possibility has been known for twenty-nine years. It did not require the development of synthetic DNA, ~~so~~ ~~actually accomplish the fact.~~ ~~But as a matter of fact, I can't quarrel with Nirenberg's statement in the precise form in which he made it, but I believe we have to consider this in a somewhat larger context.~~ ^{in addition} Can we in fact program mammalian cells, in the sense of introducing genetic information of known import, calculated to produce an explicit purpose related to the genetic machinery? ~~As a matter of fact we do, in this light,~~ already practice biological engineering on a very large scale, and we are doing a rather sloppy job of it, and since this particular element of applied biology may indeed be a prototype for the way in which we may end up broadcasting favorable genes in other ways in the future, I would like to spend a little more time on it.

I am talking about viruses used for immunization. Polio virus particles, measles virus particles, any of a number of other agents have been developed in forms which have been attenuated in order to reduce their acute pathogenicity,

so as to make convenient the job of immunizing children so that they will not
 come down with frank disease. ~~Now~~, I don't want to rock the boat on this ques-
 tion; I still think immunization is a good thing to do, and I don't deplore its
 development or its application at the present time. But I think I must speak
 out for a much more intense study than now exists of the human impact of these
 practices. It is very sloppy, it is unconscionably sloppy, considering the
 scope with which this form of biological engineering ;is carried out at the
 present time. The use of live virus is ~~as~~ sloppy first of all because ~~if~~ the
 techniques of production, monitoring, specification, characterization of live
 viral agents belongs to the dark ages. ~~I can give you empirical proof of that~~
~~statement by the fact that approximately a third or half of a billion doses of~~
 SV-40 virus were included in the polio virus immunization of the last decade!
 This was a passenger virus, originally, in fact constantly present in the
 monkey kidney cells that we used for growing both the Sabin and the Salk vaccines.
 It proved to be more resistant to formaldehyde than polio virus, and therefore
 was particularly prevalent in Salk vaccine preparations, since these were used at
 a higher dose in terms of total virus particles. It was also present in the
 Sabin preparations. It may have been a subject of greater concern in the Salk
 virus because this is administered parenterally, and the SV-40 would not have to
 face the barrier of penetrating the intestinal mucosa before it entered into the
 general circulation. ~~SV-40~~ ^{is} a virus which seems to be a harmless passenger
 in the rhesus monkeys used as ~~a source~~ ^{the} sources of tissue cultures for growing the
 polio ~~XXXXXX~~ virus - in fact, it is very difficult to demonstrate the virus
 in that species and very difficult to demonstrate it using human material, and
 one needs the green monkey to obtain good plaques with enough cytolytic action
 to demonstrate it. It's a notorious virus because it will induce cancer when
 injected into newborn hamsters, but after the hamster is a few days old, it has
 no known important effect on these organisms.

It is a little late in the day to raise any alarms about this particular subject. Nothing very catastrophic actually seems to have happened, in spite of the fact that many millions of children and adults have received rather large doses of this virus in past history. The Public Health Service thinks badly enough of the procedure that it now prohibits the presence of SV-40 virus in current batches of vaccine, so with one hand we have expert assurance that it can do no harm, but on the other, well, we'd better not have any more of it.

I deplore the fact that we have no way of knowing whether either of the SV-40 virus - ~~let me say, particularly the SV-40 virus~~ - or even the attenuated polio virus - have caused more subtle deleterious effects on mankind. We may never know whether the use of these vaccines was for the betterment of mankind, because we don't collect the kind of data that could enable us to reach this conclusion. It seems rather likely, judging from other characteristics of the present generation, that these viruses may have caused a reduction in IQ of the contemporary generation. ~~Whatever~~ If that were a matter of 20 points on the usual scales, we might have discovered it. If it were a matter of 2 points, we couldn't possibly have discovered it. And yet an average reduction of 2 points of IQ, ~~whatever that means, but whatever is behind a statement like that,~~ would surely be regarded as something most deleterious to mankind. Well, it could have happened. It could also have happened that the IQ's ~~were~~ went up by ^{points} 20, and our current generation may be too smart to want to bother with taking such tests very aggressively!

One of the principle indictments that I would make in our contemporary exercises in genetic engineering is that we don't realize that we're doing it, and we're not following what's happening. One of the reasons for this is that we are looking too far in the future instead of ^{at} yesterday and today for the kind of wise outlook on what is happening right now in the species in the use of contemporary applied ~~ix~~ biology, so that we can ask the right questions on a large enough population base that perhaps we could tell that what's going on

is for better or for worse. Now, it's not implausible that polio virus might get into some of the neurones of a developing child and have some specific morphogenetic effects, ~~in that context, but we have no way of knowing it~~. In fact, it's even possible that the neurone count of children who have received these viruses is larger than that of other individuals in the population, by 10 or 15%, and we would have no way of knowing it from our existing data. I can't stress this point too strongly, that we do not watch our populations closely enough to see even major movements taking place within them.

My second criticism has to do with the way that these agents are prepared, ~~while its really part of the previous one, that we~~ are not taking advantage of the kind of techniques that Nirenberg and Kornberg and I and others like to use daily in our own laboratories in a more rarified research context. There is no excuse for virus preparation being as contaminated as polio virus was, ^{quite} ~~part~~ apart from the difficulties of detection, the only way it could possibly happen is that we are content to use biological reagents of enormous potency without taking any real care to see that they are pure, homogeneous and ^{what} that they are intended to be ~~by~~ physical chemical criteria. It was enough that the polio virus preparations produced the right kind of plaques on a selective group of tissue culture media for them to be authenticated as being pure polio virus.

~~on the usual media and therefore was disregarded completely. I don't know this as an explicit fact, but I would have to be surprised if it were difficult to distinguish polio virus from SG 40 by any of the physical-chemical criteria that we use every day of the week in our research laboratories.~~
~~But~~ the virus agents used for this kind of genetic engineering applied on a large scale to our population are crude culture filtrates. They are subjected to no biological or chemical purification whatsoever before they are packaged in sugar cubes and passed out to the kids in school. And I don't see any excuse for it except the fact there is a myth that virus

immunization programs are mass medicine, ~~that they're not to be done under any~~
~~circumstances with the kind of~~ ~~decision with which we will~~
~~exercise ordinary medicine,~~ and of course they're not at all to be labelled
as biological engineering having anything whatsoever to do with the new
molecular biology. However, before we become to exercised about biological
engineering and its hazards and a lack of decision in our understanding of
the mechanisms that we're using on such a large scale, I think we ought
also to remember that we practice psychological engineering also on a very,
very large scale. ~~horrible example of~~

~~it, is psychological engineering is certainly under very vehement social~~
~~control.~~ It's compulsory. It's mostly pretty-well programmed from reasonably
central authorities. It's equally unscientific, and we call it education.

Q I think we should consider very literally that education shapes the child,
shapes the character of the next generation in just as explicit a sense as any
of the biological innovations that we have in mind and possibly if you believe
some theories of the nature of learning, even from a morphological point of
view, that is if you believe learning has something to do with the morpho-
genesis of the central nervous system as many people do. If we try to
look beyond the specifications of what Dr. Nirenberg has laid out so con-
veniently for me to use as a point of exposure, ^{we} might ask what else would I
quarrel with him about. I've already quarrelled with him on the time scale.
He says something twenty-five years in the future and I've tried to point out
that we're talking about events that were well launched five years ago or
ten years ago. The future events that he's talking about happened yesterday.
~~In more explicit terms I think again he's wrong in time scale that even~~
~~within the frame work of what he was talking about, the twenty five years~~
~~is much too long a time.~~ However, ^{now} permit me to indulge in some of my own
hypotheses of sources of evolutionary innovation. Let me begin with the
most explicitly germinal ^{or eugenic} changes, ~~or what we might draw as the eugenic~~

Here I would like to go back to viruses. Some of you may have been puzzled exactly why I called the virus immunization an example of genetic engineering. Well, let me illustrate what I meant by a hypothetical proposal that was put forward most explicitly recently by ^{Stanfield Rogers.} ~~Francis Rodgers.~~ He found that in tissue culture the *Shope* virus will, ~~as many viruses do, in fact~~ as all viruses do, induce the formation of certain special enzymes, many of which have a perceptible relationship to specific virus growth in the cells in question. Many viruses for example induce a unique *thymidine kinase*. Most of the bacterial phages induce unique DNA polymerases that have properties somewhat different from the typical DNA polymerase of the bacteria that they previously infect, and so on. So, in fact, it is not regarded as commonplace to think that one of the special functions of the information in a virus particle is to impose a few special enzymes that are related to the unique replicability of the viral nucleic acid as compared to that of the host. In addition, the virus generates a capsid^{id} protein to protect itself outside of the infected cell, and that's what viruses are all about.

Induced enzyme synthesis by viruses in a rather non-human context are very familiar now. Dr. Rodgers at Oak Ridge noted, and I believe others have as well, that the *Shope* virus in tissue culture would also induce another enzyme, arginase, which has no obvious adaptive value to the virus, but we take it for granted that ^{it's} due to our own myopia that we are unable to see why it's there. That was a stepping-stone to another finding of his, namely, this was reported in Nature last December, that a considerable number of people who have used the *Shope* virus in the laboratory had very low serum arginine levels, a pretty convincing case that they are statistically different from the

(no words left out here, continue next page)

rest of us, ~~and~~ though I do not believe he has definitely demonstrated that this is the same phenomenon as has been demonstrated ⁱⁿ tissue culture, it's indeed very plausible that virus workers in the laboratory have acquired

infections with the Shoke virus which is known to have no effect in Man, but that they have indeed been ^{cryptically} infected that some of ~~those~~ ^{Chick's} tissue cells have ^{been to} induced/a form a particularly active argenase ~~and this argenase has reduced serum level of argenase in them~~. This has had no perceptual effect on the performance of these individuals unless their ^{intellectual} pre-occupation with the Shoke virus is somehow ^{a response} related to their low serum argenase, ~~although we don't know how to make the kind of measurements in this~~ types of man that can really make ~~for phenomenon~~ ~~as well~~. But you could not have told them apart by looking at them or by watching them, you had to measure their serum argenase ⁱⁿ to know that they'd had any previous experience of this kind. ~~Well~~, ^H this may have been the first understood example in Man of the ~~approximate~~ appearance of a virus-induced enzyme as an augmentation of the genotype of these individuals, at least with respect to the somatic behavior, these individuals are ~~not~~ stigmatized by the fact that they have some additional genetic information than what they were born with, the information coded by the Shoke virus for the production of this specific protein. ~~And that is suggested why we don't know of any use for argenase in Man, I don't believe there are any argenase~~ ~~humans known or any genetic diseases that might be incorporated in~~ ~~the way~~, so we can't cure any known metabolic defect, If we could just find one it might make a very nice case for using Shoke viruses in a constructive sense. ~~The virus does not itself~~ ~~in these people~~ ~~by the way, and that it appears to grown in a cryptic form to leave at~~ ~~least some of its genetic information behind in the cell/although not the~~ ~~entire virus genotype is present in any cell is an open question. It's an~~ ^{whether or}

~~equal open question for any virus infection that has long lasting effects.~~
 Rodgers proposed ~~to~~ ^{to} look for viruses that make more useful enzymes, for
 example, ~~let's look for viruses that make~~ will induce the formation of
 phenylalanine hydroxylase, ~~and~~ and you all know that we could then cure
 PKU at a fundamental level, we might even want to get into the fetus and not
 wait for the birth of the recessive homozygote who might be impaired in his
 mental development because of his accumulation of phenylalanine
 on an ordinary diet. And if we can't find such viruses we really are just
 in the brink of being able to make them, that is a possibility of splicing
 a messenger RNA that codes for ordinary human phenylalanine hydroxylase to
 the viral RNA of one or another infectious virus seems like a very plausible
^{possibility}
 possible, both in the point of view of the chemical steps needed to fabricate
 such hybrids and from the point of view of the likely persistence of such
~~xxxxxx~~ viruses themselves in much the same fashion as the original passenger
 viruses would have done. So this would have seem^{ed} to me the nearest thing on
 the horizon by way of the calculated ~~use~~ ^{use} of viruses for genetic engineering,
~~and so it occurred to me it's~~ ^{it's} exactly what we are already doing for immunization
 purposes. The only difference is that the induced enzyme which Rodgers is
 calling for~~x~~ is, in fact, an induced antigenic protein, ~~which may indeed be~~
~~an enzyme for all we know, but it is some specific protein~~ encoded by the
 viral nucleic acid, ~~who~~ ^{this} we would like to see ~~produced~~ produced in the human
 being who receives this information ~~who would like to be produced~~ on a life-
 long basis (so we don't have to reimmunize) ~~it's~~ the purpose of introducing
 that protein is to evoke an antibody that responds against it so that you will
 have immunity covering against infection by other virus ~~xxx~~ particles. But

it's fundamental biological operation is exactly the same as that of the late addition of the gene to the organism so the calculated production of the specific protein encoded by that genetic information.

This has come to the top of my list as ^a candidate phenomenon for human ^A intervention because it's already here. It's hard to think of explicit ways in which ~~some of the~~ germinal changes, ~~but many of us are concerned or hope~~ ^{behavior} might be brought about under calculated control. One wonders exactly how we are going to introduce nucle^{ar} ~~type~~ changes into germ cells so that they get into the zygote, ~~otherwise you are talking about somatic sex. I'm~~ ~~little puzzled how we will ever be able to do that~~ without doing something else first, namely enabling the vegetative propagation of an existing organism. My argument is that we will somehow, if we are ever to get to the stage of the kind of genetic surgery that I think was in the back of Dr. Wrenberg's mind, have to be able to manipulate nuclei of specified origin to do something to them, and then put them into an egg so that they can operate in the normal development ^{of process} ~~hypothesis. And I would like to remind~~ ^Q ~~you that~~ if we can do that, even if we don't alter the genetic composition of that nucle^{us}, we have already accomplished a major deviation in the reproductive habits of our species from an evolutionary standpoint, because we will have introduced vegetative copying of existing genotypes, ~~and that~~ ~~implies a necessity for recombination at every generation. We always do~~ ~~have to face up to the likelihood that the technology for this will be~~ ~~discovered. As a matter of fact it's~~ ^{this has} already been done long since, ~~but so~~ ~~many of these things have in some context,~~ but so far only in amphibia. I'm talking about Briggs and King's experiment on nuclei, transplantation, ~~which I've usually thought of in this light because their~~ ~~emphasizing the congruous effects. They were not able to demonstrate that~~ ~~in many examples they could take nuclei from differentiated.~~

Wrenberg

tissues, put them into eggs and get normal development. They usually found very considerable restrictions on development. But they always do report a few cases of seemingly normal development from such transplantations, and Gurden ^{rather with the same results as with} working different species has had considerable different luck in this respect, and what's outstanding about Gurden's repetitions of these experiments to my mind, is the frequency with which essentially normal development can be obtained from the nuclear transplantation of tissues of much later and sometimes even adult origin into enucleated eggs. So that vegetatively reproduced frogs are almost a commonplace, but how long will it be before they are commonplace in man, who can tell, but I don't think any of you can give me any fundamental biological reason why man should differ from amphibia in this particular respect, why nuclear transplantation should work any differently in man than it does in amphibia.

This would be a prototype of the base-line experiment that would have to have been realized in order to exercise genetic surgery by any route I'm able to think of at the present time, and I think it'll be there first. Hopefully with connected/~~to~~ this is a ~~parthenogen~~ topic that has fascinated a few people in every biological generation. I'm reminded that ~~Holdang~~ ^R Holdang referred to it and Mrs. Holdang^g, Helen Spurway, actually attempted a demographic survey to look for the possibility of parthenogenesis in man. She found that there was a certain confusion about what parthenogenesis actually ^{meant}. You may recall she advertised ^{for} examples of this over the BBC about 12 or 13 or so years ago. She did ^{then} so not because ~~of the possibility~~ of parthenogenesis was a new idea, but ~~because~~ because a diagnosis of it ~~actually having happened appeared during this time~~. It became possible by the development of our understanding of the genetic transplantation, ~~to be able to develop objective criteria of the genetic relationship of offspring to parent, one step better even than blood group comparisons would have done~~. Her idea was that if any example of ^{or} purported parthenogenesis

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 passed the other ^{criteria} ~~searchers~~, then she ought to try reciprocal skin transplan-
 11 tations, and if they worked in one direction at least, which is the expecta-
 12 tion for parthenogenetic ^{occurrence} ~~possible~~, most any mechanism of ~~parthenogenesis~~, than
 13 corroborative
 14 it would be pretty good ~~substantive~~ evidence that it actually happened.
 15
 16 Her failure to find an unequivocal example, says nothing about the future,
 17 either on a random or a contrived basis. And I was really quite excited to
 18 see an article in last months ["]Genetics["] by Olson and ~~I forget the name of~~
 19 ~~his colleague at Purdue~~, on parthenogenesis in turkeys, where he remarks
 20 that the ~~high~~ ~~xxx~~ highest frequency of parthenogenesis in these birds is
 21 a function of the simultaneous presence of an appropriate genotype and of
 22 the ~~Rus~~ virus infecting these birds! ^{It} Quite substantial yields of ~~several~~
 23 turkey eggs parthenogenetically produced, are capable in quite a few cases
 24 of developing into normal male adults, ~~so you know what the heterogenetic sex~~
 25 ~~is, are already known~~. Well, again, if it can happen in turkeys, its going
 26 to happen in man, I'm quite sure. ^{It} ~~I think~~ any evolutionist looking at what
 27 has happened particularly at plant species is likely to remark that experiments
 28 in vegetative propagation are likely to have a much more profound evolutionary
 29 impact on the further development of the species than is the occurrence of any
 30 other sort of variability of genotypes present at any given time. These of
 31 course can work together, but the point about ^{vegetative} reproduction of course
 32 is that it is such a ^{elegant} answer to the ^{eugenicists'} ugenesis prayers. It the way
 33 of expanding an immediately adaptive genotype to the circumstances than
 34 existing, which is of course what the ugenesis are crying for, and well, you
 35 worry later about what happens when the environment changes or your ideals
 36 change. ~~I think also~~ a very reasonable predicate for future development
 37 besides the viruses that we may introduce for ~~experimental~~ somatic ^{manipulation} ~~operation~~,
 38 (we may have to generalize our concept of the virus in a couple of directions)
 39 ~~one for which there is already ample precedence~~, is that it takes very little
 40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87

to turn ~~up~~ a virus into a plasmogen^{agent}. It's only necessary that the virus be very adherent to the embryo on its way through or be passed through the milk, or be actually present within the cell of the egg as well as other cells of the body. There are any number of viruses which defacto are inherited as if they were plasmogens even though I believe in mammals there is no *authentic* example of actual *intra - oval cytoplasmic* transmission of a virus particle. I may be wrong about that and I'm not sure that pragmatically it matters very much from the point of view of ^{its} the potential human impact. If it is in fact true, that mothers who are infected with a virus *calculatedly* introduced are going to pass that infection onto their offspring, it's hair-splitting to ^{ask} the question whether that was done through some external medium environment or internally/^{as} the plasmogen. Well we may find it desirable to incorporate immunizing viruses in this way, ~~xxxxx~~ but as a matter of fact the odds are that we would prefer to avoid it. The reason we will want to avoid it ~~xxx~~ is that by all odds we want to keep the next generation of infants from being built in ^{tolerant} parent to polio virus ^{antigen} origin, which they are likely to be if that antigen is present ~~in~~ ^{before birth}. But that also suggests the kinds of antigens that we ^{might} ~~would~~ indeed want to be sure are pretty regularly transmitted, ^{can} and I imagine, for example, wanting to produce viruses that have a ~~sort of parent~~ ^{genetic} capability of coding the more common histocompatibility antigens ~~connected~~ ^{so as} to give these kids fresh kidneys when they are adults and their old kidneys have been worn out. But ~~this kind of engineering~~ this kind of engineering does represent a very plausible way of getting around some of the other engineering problems of building genetic information into existing ~~xxxxxxx~~ chromosomes. ^{Another way to} do that is to avoid using/existing ^{an} ~~chromosomes~~ ^{whole} and put in another one. And what I envisage ~~is~~ ^{the} next step along this line is building some very small chromosomes with just a few genes on them and transmitting these from cell to cell, for example by ^{cell} ~~cell~~-fusion which is already a very well

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87

authenticated technique, and is able to produce, ~~I should like to remind you~~
~~of this~~, somatic cell hybrids between forms as distantly related as fish and
 man in tissue culture. These hybrid *karyotypes* do undergo very striking
~~characteristic changes~~ once they are produced they eventually shake down to a
 number of *somatic cell* lines ~~and~~ we're just/very beginning of understanding
 how to control this and what it takes to produce a balanced ~~sterotype~~ *karyo* type that
 is able to be well adapted to the circumstances of tissue culture like of
 any one kind. I think you can see what can lie behind that, by way of very
 detailed manipulations not of the molecular biological level, but at the level
 of chromosomes introduction for producing new genotypes. Combine that again
 with ~~nuclear~~ *nuclear* transplantation and we really do have *germinal* genetic
 engineering on a very large scale.

Up to a few years ago I think genetic selection would have been
 near the top of the list of anyone who wanted to look past the usual ~~an~~ opera-
 tion of contrived somatic selection that is the ordinary forms of selection
 of somatic phenotypes. This is, in fact, turned out to be almost the
 least promising of all. It does look as if the gametes are expressing
 a very small ~~portion~~ portion of all of their genes and if you manipulate a gameton
 being in such a way that it tells you what its existing genotype is, at the
 moment at least, you've removed the possibility of using that same gamete
 for any other purpose, for fertilization or whatever. But I think ~~we~~ before
 we reach too rapidly at the very ineffective methods that are now being proposed,
 that would have been proposed in the last 40 years for ~~genetic~~ *eugenic* manipula-
 tion in man we could give some consideration to the possibility of inducing
 or the processes and using somesort of somatic selection on
 those cells in order to find those genotypes which are appropriate for use
 as germ cells. This sounds so weak these days by comparison with the other
 kinds of engineering operations that are starting right before us that I *almost*
 hesitate to mention it.

And I'm sure that any of you to this kind of joint psychedelic exercise would be able to add some of your own experiences, many other ways in which we could contrive to do a considerable amount of genetic engineering in man if we just remember that man is an organism and not very different from your own typical subject of experimental investigation, except ⁱⁿ ~~that~~ his resistance to being experimented with. ^{with} Cell and tissue culture ~~and~~ that resistance ^{work} seems to disappear and you can do a lot of your anti-~~genetic~~ ^{genetic} work without running ^{afoul of} social interdiction. However I so far stress what I called eugenic effects, ^{i.e.} ~~what I had in mind were~~ germinal modifications and I wonder about the long-term relevance of that distinction. Now it's a little hard for geneticist to play it down; our image, our unique distinctions from all the rest of the biologists is our ability to foist that ~~that~~ distinction on all the rest of us. What is genetic and germinal is something very, very different from what is somatic developmental. There is something permanent about the ^{germinal} general aspects of an organism. But I'm not sure whether this ^{not} will/become obsolete in the framework of *human affairs*, to a degree of the reasoning I would put forward is along the same line that you would now regard certain genetic differences as already substantially irrelevant in man. I hope, for example, that the amount of hair on my head, which I do believe is under some genetic control, really is not very important because I can wear ~~it~~ a cap, ~~and we can make much more sophisticated kinds of contrivances to take place of what our biological endowment was.~~ ^{Well—} ~~Now that's the classic example of what our concept I'm sure you're all very well acquainted with, and I won't elaborate on.~~ ^{i.e.,} The extent to which culture replaces biological endowment in the conduct of our own affairs. The more we learn about development the ~~the~~ deeper that's going to be. The medical example of this ^{is} are well known and are sometimes ~~de~~ ^{deplorable}. It's also less ^{important} ~~unfortunate~~ now if I'm a diabetic because we know about insulin and better insulins have

come along, other kinds of drugs have come along, we sort of on the edge of thinking about using cell transplants to take the place of a failed lung and so on. And while this will entail a certain amount of extra cost it's just part of the cost of keeping civilization going that we become dependent on it in so many ways. ^A Well ~~this is sort of~~ the lowest level of genotypic irrelevance, the technicollogical substitution of other kinds of artifices to the things we usually depend on. It isn't terribly important that we have great strength anymore, we have machines to take their place. We have automobiles to take the place of ^{good} legs, and so on and so forth. (There are some ^{other} aspects to good legs. ^{*}) ~~The point I would like to stress, and I don't think it's understood well enough or you wouldn't hear very much about eugenics at all in the contemporary context, is that this kind of developmental intervention and in order to stress how firmly opposed it is to eugenics, I try to coin a sufficiently opposite name, so I thought "euphenics," but euphenics is really the same thing as medicine.~~

^A Euphenics is beginning to acquire the kind of resources that make it relevant to the most fundamental aspects of human personality. Now here, or all things I've talked about so far, ^{fall} ~~fall~~ into insignificance by comparison with the one thing that distinguishes man from the other species, and that is his brain. We are just beginning to get the faintest ^{insight} ~~glimpse~~ of what it is that controls the development of the brain. And the things we do as soon as we do understand that control, as soon as we know which hormones ^{are} involved in programming the development of the brain, what relevance will there be to the existing assortment of genes that control the count of neurons that we might have or the other much more complicated ways to determine what our performance on an IQ test is going to be. We so far just do not intervene at all, we don't even provide reasonable support for the most important of our developmental processes. Mostly because we don't

* i.e., leave some collective functions as is!

understand it at all. We are just beginning to investigate it, we have such findings as one nerve growth factor finally being gotten out in reasonably pure form, some understanding of its nature as a protein hormone. We are obliged to believe that a similar kind of programming is going to apply to the central nervous system generally. Not only will existing genotypes for the development of intelligence be irrelevant, it's to be expected that there will be ~~paradoxical~~ ^{paradoxical} effects. We ~~know~~ ^{know} ~~calibrate~~ our estimate of genotypic performance in terms ~~of~~ what happens in the relatively uncontrolled situation of a normal gestation with no external hormone control of brain development, ~~and~~ ⁱⁿ fact, until reasonably recently it was rather important that the child not be born with too large a brain, because if he did he'd run into obstetrical difficulties. Well these are all points that we of course can get around to in considerable extent by medical and surgical intervention and there will be no relationship between the response of the endo^(?)genous development of the organism, which is what is now measured and what will happen when we are putting in an explicit program. We can use variations of genotype as a control ^{of} brain development to learn a great deal about the development of the brain, I ~~mean~~ ^{to} ~~clue~~ ^{the} phenylalanine ^{plays an important part} in its mental development is one of the kind of things we can't afford to ignore. But I can see very little place for

~~intervention and there will be no relationship between the response of the endogenous development or the autotomize development of an organism which is what is now measured and what will happen when we are putting in an explicit program. We can use variations of genotype as a control brain development to learn a great deal about the development of the brain. I mean to clue the phenylalanine~~

treasuring too much the existing genotypes for a ~~month's~~ intellectual performance in terms of their probable relevance to the control world of

brain development.

Now there are going to be some paradoxes and dilemmas in this field as there are anywhere else. There's a price to be paid for almost any kind of advance and here we're talking about something that sort of happened yesterday also. There are some fascinating reports from Dr. Money's laboratory, John Hopkins, about the impact of hormonal virilization on intellectual development. Though his data really are not very good, I'll pretend that they are, they are just hints; you really can't rely on them as being affirmative truths. For intellectual development the situation is must too complicated for that to happen easily. But these are pointed at series of cases for which there has been either a natural accident, for example the idiopathic virilization syndrome in which girls with an excessive output of ~~androgens~~ ^{androgens} or, where in fact there has been a contrived euphenic intervention where little girls were exposed to ~~project their own~~ ^{progestins} while in utero in order to have them be born at all. This is the ~~xxxx~~ ^{progestin} treatment indicated as a means of sustaining a pregnancy in the face of a threatened abortion on the part of the mother. It has been known for some time that the administration of this hormone could lead to anatomical ~~masculinization~~ ^{masculinization} or development of excessively large ~~clitorides~~ ^{clitorides} which could be ~~surgically~~ ^{surgically} diminished ~~and though denote~~ ^{without} important evidence that this resulted in any deleterious changes in later development. Well, ~~Money~~ ^{Money} found two things about some of these girls as they grew up to be young women. First of all, by the kinds of tests that as a psychologist he was able to administer, they were tomboys. They had adopted a masculine point-of-view about the world and if this an explicit influence of a hormone and the parts of the brain that are concerned with gender identification, it will of course be of extraordinary interest in that light alone. Now, life is too complicated to draw such a simple conclusion. Of course the parents of these girls knew something about their history, and they've learned something about it themselves, and we don't know to what extent the social milieu was the vehicle

psychological
 for this/mass immunization. Together with that I think none of you might be
 too surprised to find that they also had an exaltation of their IQ's. The
 reason one shouldn't be surprised is that with the biological endowment of a
 complete set of X chromosomes and with some of the pugnacity of the male, how
 can you beat that kind of female! Well, there's already enough of a hint that
 this works that I ~~don't know~~ if there are any pregnant women here tonight, ~~but~~
~~I'd be surprised/you didn't~~ ^{that some of} contemplate trying to masculinize your fetuses at
 the present time, particularly if you knew that they were girls! ~~That's why~~

we have a culture that recognizes male values very much more than it does
 our
 female, and most of/eugenic efforts are dedicated to producing super man and
 the hell with the women. (Are you going to go along with that or not?)

Until we can resolve that very simple issue of human values as to whether
 we have a bisexual society or a unisexual society in fact, I think we have
 to be very restrained about the other interventions that we want to make in
 human performance. And I should perhaps also remind you that everything by
 which we now calibrate human genotypes is in the framework of our existing
 culture, our existing educational system, and all of the rest of it, ~~and~~
 one of these days we are going to find out something about education, and
 I wonder then if any of the ground rules of that calibration are going to
 be relevant at all, along the same lines of argument that I had with respect
 to euphenics.

I would like to revert to the main thrust of Dr. Nirenberg's concerns,
 and that is, should we wait to use genetic messages for the programming
 of human cells until we can understand all of the consequences and be able
 to make a final judgement about human betterment? I would reiterate my
 concern about rash irrevocability of any of the steps we take, and I would
 like to ask for the most sympathetic consideration and for the most savage

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87

intellectual criticism of individual experiments that go to the roots of human nature. Unless, in fact, we do use genetic messages in an intelligent way to do these kinds of experiments, you will never learn anything about the man himself and we will have no future other than/endowment that we received at the time that intelligence first appeared in the species. I do not think we want to characterize ourselves as man, the uniquely conservative animal.

Thank you.