RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: acapron@law.usc.edu (acapron@law.usc.edu [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-JAN-1998 20:02:24.00

SUBJECT: COUNCIL OF EUROPE - (ETS No. 168) Additional Protocol to the ETS No.164

TO: nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU (nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Here is the Council of Europe protocol forbidding human cloning, which was signed (as Alta's e-mail indicated) by 19 on Monday (of forty CE nations). BTW, as I understand it, other nations outside Europe (like USA) could become signatories to the underlying policy as well as to such additional protocols as this one.

http://www.coe.fr/eng/legaltxt/168e.htm

Alex
> Home [Image] Previous [Image] Summary of the Treaty [Image] Signatures
> and Ratifications [Image] E-mail
>
>
>
> COUNCIL OF EUROPE CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE
> European Treaties Trait?s Europ?ens
> [Image]
> ETS No. 168 STE Nø 168
>
> ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE
> Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Dignity of the Human
> Being with regard to the Application of Biology and Medicine, on the
> Prohibition of Cloning Human Beings
>
> Paris, 12.I.1998
>
>
>
> The member States of the Council of Europe, the other States and the
> European Community Signatories to this Additional Protocol to the
> Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Dignity of the Human
> Being with regard to the Application of Biology and Medicine,
>
> Noting scientific developments in the field of mammal cloning,
> particularly through embryo splitting and nuclear transfer;
>
> Mindful of the progress that some cloning techniques themselves may
> bring to scientific knowledge and its medical application;
>
> Considering that the cloning of human beings may become a technical
> possibility;

>
> Having noted that embryo splitting may occur naturally and sometimes
> result in the birth of genetically identical twins;
>
> Considering however that the instrumentalisation of human beings
> through the deliberate creation of genetically identical human beings
> is contrary to human dignity and thus constitutes a misuse of biology
> and medicine;
>
> Considering also the serious difficulties of a medical, psychological
> and social nature that such a deliberate biomedical practice might
> imply for all the individuals involved;
>
> Considering the purpose of the Convention on Human Rights and
> Biomedicine, in particular the principle mentioned in Article 1 aiming
> to protect the dignity and identity of all human beings,
>
> Have agreed as follows:
>
> Article 1
>
> 1 Any intervention seeking to create a human being
> genetically identical to another human being, whether living
> or dead, is prohibited.
>
> 2 For the purpose of this article, the term human being
> "genetically identical" to another human being means a human
> being sharing with another the same nuclear gene set.
>
> Article 2
>
> No derogation from the provisions of this Protocol shall be
> made under Article 26, paragraph 1, of the Convention.
>
> Article 3
>
> As between the Parties, the provisions of Articles 1 and 2
> of this Protocol shall be regarded as additional articles to
> the Convention and all the provisions of the Convention
> shall apply accordingly.
>
> Article 4
>
> This Protocol shall be open for signature by Signatories to
> the Convention. It is subject to ratification, acceptance or
> approval. A Signatory may not ratify, accept or approve this
> Protocol unless it has previously or simultaneously
> ratified, accepted or approved the Convention. Instruments
> of ratification, acceptance or approval shall be deposited
> with the Secretary General of the Council of Europe.
>
> Article 5
>
> 1 This Protocol shall enter into force on the first day of

> the month following the expiration of a period of three
> months after the date on which five States, including at
> least four member States of the Council of Europe, have
> expressed their consent to be bound by the Protocol in
> accordance with the provisions of Article 4.
>
> 2 In respect of any Signatory which subsequently expresses
> its consent to be bound by it, the Protocol shall enter into
> force on the first day of the month following the expiration
> of a period of three months after the date of the deposit of
> the instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.
>
> Article 6
>
> 1 After the entry into force of this Protocol, any State
> which has acceded to the Convention may also accede to this
> Protocol.
>
> 2 Accession shall be effected by the deposit with the
> Secretary General of the Council of Europe of an instrument
> of accession which shall take effect on the first day of the
> month following the expiration of a period of three months
> after the date of its deposit.
>
> Article 7
>
> 1 Any Party may at any time denounce this Protocol by means
> of a notification addressed to the Secretary General of the
> Council of Europe.
>
> 2 Such denunciation shall become effective on the first day
> of the month following the expiration of a period of three
> months after the date of receipt of such notification by the
> Secretary General.
>
> Article 8
>
> The Secretary General of the Council of Europe shall notify
> the member States of the Council of Europe, the European
> Community, any Signatory, any Party and any other State
> which has been invited to accede to the Convention of:
>
> a any signature;
>
> b the deposit of any instrument of ratification, acceptance,
> approval or accession;
>
> c any date of entry into force of this Protocol in
> accordance with Articles 5 and 6;
>
> d any other act, notification or communication relating to
> this Protocol.
>
> In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorised thereto,

> have signed this Protocol.
>
> Done at Paris, this twelfth day of January 1998, in English and in
> French, both texts being equally authentic, in a single copy which
> shall be deposited in the archives of the Council of Europe. The
> Secretary General of the Council of Europe shall transmit certified
> copies to each member State of the Council of Europe, to the
> non-member States which have participated in the elaboration of this
> Protocol, to any State invited to accede to the Convention and to the
> European Community.
>
> [Image] [Image] [Image]
>
> Top

<BASE HREF="http://www.coe.fr/eng/legaltxt/168e.htm">

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//IETF//DTD HTML//EN">
<html>

<head>
<meta http-equiv="Content-Type"
content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">
<meta name="GENERATOR" content="Microsoft FrontPage 2.0">
<title>COUNCIL OF EUROPE - (ETS No. 168) Additional Protocol to the ETS
No.164</title> </head>

<body background="../../images/fondbleu.gif" bgcolor="#FFFFFF">

<!-- EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON THE OBTAINING
ABROAD OF INFORMATION AND EVIDENCE IN ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (STE 100)
-->

Home <img
src="../../images/etoile.gif" align="absmiddle" width="15"
height="15"> Previous <img
src="../../images/etoile.gif" align="absmiddle" width="15"
height="15"> Summary of the Treaty <img
src="../../images/etoile.gif" align="absmiddle" width="15"
height="15"> Signatures and
Ratifications <img src="../../images/etoile.gif"
align="absmiddle" width="15" height="15"> <a
href="mailto:gabrielle.dumont@daj.coe.fr">E-mail

<table border="0" cellpadding="2" width="80%">
<tr>
<td align="center" width="42%"> COUNCIL OF EUROPE
European Treaties
ETS No.

168
</td>
<td align="center" width="16%"><img
src="../../images/etoiles.gif" width="105" height="105"></td>
<td width="42%"> <font color="#800040"
size="5">CONSEIL
DE L'EUROPE
Trait?s Europ?ens
STE Nø
168
</td>
</tr>
</table>

ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE
Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Dignity of the
Human Being with regard to the Application of Biology and
Medicine, on the Prohibition of Cloning Human Beings

Paris,
12.I.1998

The member States of the Council of Europe,
the other States and the European Community Signatories to this
Additional Protocol to the Convention for the
Protection of Human Rights and Dignity of the Human Being with
regard to the Application of Biology and Medicine,

Noting scientific developments in the field
of mammal cloning, particularly through embryo splitting and
nuclear transfer;

Mindful of the progress that some cloning
techniques themselves may bring to scientific knowledge and its
medical application;

Considering that the cloning of human beings
may become a technical possibility;

Having noted that embryo splitting may occur
naturally and sometimes result in the birth of genetically
identical twins;

Considering however that the
instrumentalisation of human beings through the deliberate
creation of genetically identical human beings is contrary to
human dignity and thus constitutes a misuse of biology and
medicine;

Considering also the serious difficulties of

a medical, psychological and social nature that such a deliberate biomedical practice might imply for all the individuals involved;

Considering the purpose of the Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine, in particular the principle mentioned in Article 1 aiming to protect the dignity and identity of all human beings,

Have agreed as follows:

Article 1

<blockquote>
1 Any intervention seeking to create a human being genetically identical to another human being, whether living or dead, is prohibited.
2 For the purpose of this article, the term human being "genetically identical" to another human being means a human being sharing with another the same nuclear gene set.
</blockquote>

Article 2

<blockquote>
No derogation from the provisions of this Protocol shall be made under Article 26, paragraph 1, of the Convention.
</blockquote>

Article 3

<blockquote>
As between the Parties, the provisions of Articles 1 and 2 of this Protocol shall be regarded as additional articles to the Convention and all the provisions of the Convention shall apply accordingly.
</blockquote>

Article 4

<blockquote>
This Protocol shall be open for signature by Signatories to the Convention. It is subject to ratification, acceptance or approval. A Signatory may not ratify, accept or approve this Protocol unless it has previously or simultaneously ratified, accepted or approved the Convention. Instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval shall be deposited with the Secretary General of the Council of Europe.
</blockquote>

Article 5

<blockquote>

1 This Protocol shall enter into force on the first day of the month following the expiration of a period of three months after the date on which five States, including at least four member States of the Council of Europe, have expressed their consent to be bound by the Protocol in accordance with the provisions of Article 4.
2 In respect of any Signatory which subsequently expresses its consent to be bound by it, the Protocol shall enter into force on the first day of the month following the expiration of a period of three months after the date of the deposit of the instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.
</blockquote>

Article 6

<blockquote>
1 After the entry into force of this Protocol, any State which has acceded to the Convention may also accede to this Protocol.
2 Accession shall be effected by the deposit with the Secretary General of the Council of Europe of an instrument of accession which shall take effect on the first day of the month following the expiration of a period of three months after the date of its deposit.
</blockquote>

Article 7

<blockquote>
1 Any Party may at any time denounce this Protocol by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary General of the Council of Europe.
2 Such denunciation shall become effective on the first day of the month following the expiration of a period of three months after the date of receipt of such notification by the Secretary General.
</blockquote>

Article 8

<blockquote>
The Secretary General of the Council of Europe shall notify the member States of the Council of Europe, the European Community, any Signatory, any Party and any other State which has been invited to accede to the Convention of:
a any signature;
b the deposit of any instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession;
c any date of entry into force of this Protocol in accordance with Articles 5 and 6;
d any other act, notification or communication relating to this Protocol.
</blockquote>

In witness whereof the undersigned, being
duly authorised thereto, have signed this Protocol.

Done at Paris, this twelfth day of January
1998, in English and in French,
both texts being equally authentic, in a single copy which shall
be deposited in the archives of the Council of Europe. The
Secretary General of the Council of Europe shall transmit
certified copies to each member State of the Council of Europe,
to the non-member States which have participated in the
elaboration of this Protocol, to any State invited to accede to
the Convention and to the European Community.

<img src="../../images/etoile.gif" width="15"
height="15"> <img src="../../images/etoile.gif" width="15"
height="15"> <img src="../../images/etoile.gif" width="15"
height="15">

Top
</body>
</html>

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: robin alta charo <racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu> (robin alta charo <racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-NOV-1998 09:55:08.00

SUBJECT: clarification

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
sorry -- a clarification on the second point in my email, about our
licensing restrictions on stem cells.

stem cells cannot themselves divide to the fetal stage even if put into a
uterus; i.e., stem cells are not embryos. as they divide, they will become
a disorganized mass of tissue, rather than developing embryonic structures.

but, our restriction on putting stem cells *or their derivatives* back into
a uterus is aimed at experiments that would, for example, use stem cells
for the nucleus in a cloning experiment with a fresh enucleated egg. it
would also cover human/non-human hybrids, should one ever be developed that
could be grown to the fetal stage.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: racharo@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU (racharo@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JAN-1998 14:13:14.00

SUBJECT: fyi, re: caplan column today

TO: nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU (nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
fyi, i sent this today in response to art's column on cloning in
the ny times.

>
>Message-ID: <34CF5EFA.270@facstaff.wisc.edu>
>Date: Wed, 28 Jan 1998 08:38:18 -0800
>From: "r. alta charo" <racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu>
>Reply-To: racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu
>Organization: university of wisconsin
>X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0Gold (Win95; I)
>MIME-Version: 1.0
>To: letters@nytimes.com
>Subject: "Why Rush to Ban Cloning?" by Art Caplan, 1-28-98
>Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
>
>To the editors of the NY Times,
>
>I was gratified to read Art Caplan calling for a moratorium on
cloning
>to make babies, but am puzzled and disappointed that he chose not to
>mention that this is precisely the recommendation made last June
by the
>National Bioethics Advisory Commission. NBAC specifically called for
>federal legislation placing a five-year, self-expiring ban on
>applications that involve transferring a cloned embryo back to a
woman's
>body for gestation, as preliminary safety studies in other species
are a
>necessary prerequisite to an informed discussion of the ethics of
this
>technology. NBAC clearly distinguished these applications from those
>involving genes, unimplanted embryos, or other species. NBAC also
>called for expanding protections for human subjects of research, and
>recommended public education and cooperation with other nations in
the
>debate over somatic cell nuclear transfer cloning technology.
>
>R. Alta Charo, J.D.
>Member, National Bioethics Advisory Commission

>
>Associate Professor, Law and Medical Ethics
>University of Wisconsin - Madison
>
>Jan - June 1998: on sabbatical leave as
>Senior Fellow, Program In Genomics, Ethics and Society
>Stanford Center for Biomedical Ethics
>701A Welch Road, Suite 1105
>Palo Alto CA 94304
>tel: 650-723-5760 (main center number)
>tel: 650-498-5386 (direct dial)
>tel: 415-661-9987 (home)
>fax: 650-725-6131
>email: racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu
>
>

---

r. alta charo, j.d.
senior fellow, stanford center for biomedical ethics
701a welch road, suite 1005
palo alto, ca 94304
650-723-5760 (tel)
650-725-6131 (fax)
415-661-9987 (home)
racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu (racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JAN-1998 00:44:13.00

SUBJECT: amazing amazing

TO: nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU (nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
anybody else here as startled as i was to find that cloning had
risen to the level of saddam hussein on the list of things too
important to leave out of the state of the union address?

---

r. alta charo, j.d.
senior fellow, stanford center for biomedical ethics
701a welch road, suite 1005
palo alto, ca 94304
650-723-5760 (tel)
650-725-6131 (fax)
415-661-9987 (home)
racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: MeslinE@od.nih.gov (MeslinE@od.nih.gov [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JAN-1998 09:40:30.00

SUBJECT: RE: amazing amazing

TO: nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU (nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
For those who weren't at the National Academy of Science talk given by Vice President Al Gore last week, portions of Pres. Clinton's talk were identical (good speech-writing goes a long way). The example of the CFTR gene been mapped in 9 years, and Parkinsons being mapped in 9 days was straight out of the Gore text.

Eric M.

p.s. As a reminder, the report on "Genetics Information in the Workplace", released by Gore on Jan 20 at the NAS, is in your briefing books under Tab H. It will be a valuable read, particularly for the "planning bucket" conversation.
-----Original Message-----
From: Carol Greider [SMTP:cgreider@bs.jhmi.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 1998 6:35 AM
To: NBAC Members E-list
Subject: Re: amazing amazing

>anybody else here as startled as i was to find that cloning had
>risen to the level of saddam hussein on the list of things too
>important to leave out of the state of the union address?
>

YES!
But also, genetic privacy, genetic discrimination, and a great increase for
the NIH budget. Glad I watched in the end!

Carol

****

Carol Greider, Ph.D.
Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine
617 Hunterian Bldg
725 N. Wolfe street
Baltimore MD 21205

Phone: (410) 614-6506
Fax (410) 614-2987

e-mail: cgreider@bs.jhmi.edu

****

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: stipton@asrm.com (stipton@asrm.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JAN-1998 15:28:22.00

SUBJECT: Adhoc: cloning and embryo research

TO: adhoc@aamcinfo.aamc.org (adhoc@aamcinfo.aamc.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
January 28, 1998

Dear Colleague:

The latest rumor from Capitol Hill indicates that cloning legislation will be on the floor of the Senate early next week. Unfortunately, we also understand that there will be a serious attempt made to use this legislation to permanently enact an embryo research ban.

We have been asked by Senate members who support medical research and freedom of scientific inquiry to circulate the attached letter to other members of the medical community. In order to be ready for next week's debate, we need sign-ons by close of business Friday January 30.

We appreciate the support many of you have provided before on embryo research, fetal tissue research and cloning. We also appreciate the reasons some groups may have to avoid this issue. None of us are looking for this kind of fight, we would all rather spend our time pursuing earmarks for our own particular research efforts. For many of you, it may be hard to envision how any of this effects your members. Your members may not be engaging in research of this kind. It may be that for now, it is hard to see how this research will improve care for the patients you represent. Surely though, as advocates for medical research you all understand that we cannot say what line of research will yield the fundamental breakthroughs that will change the whole field.

There comes a time when as a community of patients, scientists and physicians we must stand up and be counted. It is unacceptable for medical research to be threatened in order to score points in this country's on-going battle over abortion. I urge you to join us in our efforts to protect the freedom of scientific inquiry that is so vital to our field.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at 202-863-2494 or via email stipton@asrm.com.

Sincerely,

Sean Tipton
Public Affairs Administrator

Proposed letter to members of Congress

February, 1998

Dear Member:

The scientific and medical community, and the patients they serve, have made it clear since the announcement of Dolly's birth that they are opposed to using somatic cell nuclear transfer cloning to clone a human. However, it is imperative that legislative efforts to stop human cloning do not negatively impact medical research. Unfortunately, it now appears that many groups opposed to freedom of scientific inquiry are seeking to use cloning legislation as a vehicle to enact a permanent ban on embryo research.

As you know, these groups have already prevented the National Institutes of Health from funding and providing oversight of research using early stage blastocysts or even zygotes. Acquiescing to pressure in order to pass an Appropriations bill is one thing, enacting a permanent statutory prohibition, with criminal penalties, is quite another.

Only through research, including embryo research, will scientists find improved treatments and even cures for debilitating diseases such as Parkinson's, diabetes, cancer and infertility. By banning embryo research we will sentence millions of people to needless suffering because research and progress into their disease will end.

We strongly urge you to use caution when dealing with any cloning prohibition, and to strongly oppose any effort to enact a permanent embryo research prohibition.

Sincerely,

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-adhoc@aamcinfo.aamc.org@INET@LNGTWY (owner-adhoc@aamcinfo.aamc.org@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-FEB-1998 20:08:13.00

SUBJECT: Adhoc: Cloning Legislation

TO: Rachel E. Levinson@EOP (Rachel E. Levinson@EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Colleagues:

I am writing to bring everyone up to speed on the status of the anti-cloning legislative proposals, and to ask for help. Please note that while I am borrowing the Ad Hoc Group's List Serve capacity, I am not speaking for the Ad Hoc Group.

Senators Feinstein and Kennedy have introduced a bill (S 1602) as has Senator Bond (S 1599). Bonds has been re-introduced with Sen. Lott as main sponsor (S. 1601) in order to make it a leadership bill.

The Bond bill prohibits the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer technology. It prohibits the use of this technology to produce an embryo from the earliest stages, but it does not define the term somatic cell anywhere.

The Kennedy/Feinstein Bill contains clear definitions, has a federal preemption, has a sunset in 10 years, and it makes illegal any attempt to implant an embryo produced from cloning into a woman's uterus.

We think the Bond bill is very dangerous for the medical research community. It makes the use of a specific technology in medical research a federal crime, punishable by 10 years in prison.

Its broad prohibition and imprecise wording endanger many areas of medical research including gene therapy and stem cell research. It also poses risks for several promising infertility treatments.

We expect an attempt to bring the Bond (now the Lott) bill to the floor of the Senate as early as Thursday, and certainly by early next week.

I hope that regardless of where you or your organization stand on cloning or cloning legislation, you will at least object to the bringing this measure to the floor in such a hurry. I would urge you to contact members of the Senate and ask them to avoid acting on this with such haste and instead deal with this matter in the serious deliberative manner it deserves.

Please feel free to contact me with questions or comments.

Sean Tipton
American Society for Reproductive Medicine
202-863-2494========== ATTACHMENT 1 ==========
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
RFC-822-headers:
Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)
id <01IT6SZP7IIO017SXO@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for "Rachel E. Levinson"@oa.eop.gov; Wed,

04 Feb 1998 16:40:10 -0500 (EST)
Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)
by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01IT6SZNL3WG00B5M2@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for
Rachel_E._Levinson@oa.eop.gov; Wed, 04 Feb 1998 16:40:08 -0500 (EST)
Received: from aamcinfo.aamc.org ([143.220.1.4])
by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)
with ESMTP id <01IT6SYZ06JI001EEI@STORM.EOP.GOV> for
Rachel_E._Levinson@oa.eop.gov; Wed, 04 Feb 1998 16:39:37 -0500 (EST)
Received: (from daemon@localhost) by aamcinfo.aamc.org (8.7.6/8.7.3)
id QAA06991 for adhoc-outgoing; Wed, 04 Feb 1998 16:20:03 -0500 (EST)
Received: from aamc.org (wpo.aamc.org [143.220.26.49])
by aamcinfo.aamc.org with SMTP (8.7.6/8.7.3)
id QAA06979 for <adhoc@aamcinfo.aamc.org>; Wed,
04 Feb 1998 16:19:59 -0500 (EST)
Received: from AAMC-Message_Server by aamc.org with Novell_GroupWise; Wed,
04 Feb 1998 16:22:06 -0500
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Content-disposition: inline
Precedence: bulk
========== END ATTACHMENT 1 ==========

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Rachel_E._Levinson@oa.eop.gov (Rachel_E._Levinson@oa.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-FEB-1998 20:08:20.00

SUBJECT: Telegram on Proposed Cloning Legislation

TO: nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU (nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Message Creation Date was at 4-FEB-1998 09:56:00

fyi
---------- Forwarded by Rachel E. Levinson/OSTP/EOP on 02/04/98
09:56 AM ----------

hgarrison @ faseb.org
02/04/98 09:16:50 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
Subject: Telegram on Proposed Cloning Legislation

During yesterday's Public Affairs Executive Committee (PAEC) conference call, the PAEC instructed us to send the following telegram to all members of the U.S. Senate:

"The Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB) urges the Senate to proceed extremely cautiously as it considers legislation regarding human cloning. While the Federation considers the cloning of a human being to be reprehensible, dangerous, and unethical, we are concerned that overly restrictive legislation could unintentionally preclude critical research of great benefit to the American people. We believe that S. 1599, currently pending consideration by the Senate, would be damaging to worthwhile research. By flatly banning all use of human somatic cell nuclear technology for any purpose, this legislation would close off key areas of research which do not involve the creation of humans. We urge that the Senate not approve this leg islation in its current form as it does not balance appropriate ethical considerations with the health needs of the American people."

The message was sent yesterday evening for delivery today.

Howard H. Garrison, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Public Affairs
Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology
9650 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, MD 20814
voice: (301) 571-0657
fax: (301) 571-0686

Message Sent
To:_____
baintond @ chanoff.ucsf.edu
rablab @ uci.edu
db8g @ virginia.edu
brinkley @ bcm.tmc.edu
brd @ virginia.edu
fisch @ med.cornell.edu
gierasch @ chem.umass.edu
joel.g.hardman @ mcmail.vanderbilt.edu
mjackson @ execofc.FASEB.org
JOLLIE @ Gems.vcu.edu
uncdgk @ med.unc.edu
kknight @ luc.edu
brian @ uoxray.uoregon.edu
mcmanus @ uthscsa.edu
newburgh @ faseb.org
ongde @ ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu
rmp @ nucleus.immunol.washington.edu
pedersen @ cgl.ucsf.edu
suttie @ biochem.wisc.edu
jim_schafer @ vesta.cmc.uab.edu
mike_sheetz @ cellbio.duke.edu
priley @ ucsd.edu
petevh @ morel.uoregon.edu
yount @ wsu.edu
chicago @ itsa.ucsf.edu
teitelbaum_s @ medicine.wustl.edu
tandersen @ ccgateway.amc.edu
csenecal @ urmc.rochester.edu
beckerle @ bioscience.biology.utah.edu
brinkley @ bcm.tmc.edu
haywood @ uthscsa.edu
ichow @ faseb.org
hugli @ scripps.edu
mjackson @ execofc.FASEB.org
rokelley @ medusa.unm.edu
richard-lynch @ uiowa.edu
schach @ socrates.Berkeley.EDU
mlokhandwala @ uh.edu
mstephens @ vsadc.com
shwhite @ uci.edu
yount @ wsu.edu

naider @ postbox.csi.cuny.edu
speicher @ wista.wistar.upenn.edu
partrinc @ wpogate.slu.edu

Message Copied
To:_____
ahellers @ aps.faseb.org
litch @ faseb.org
pfarnham @ asbmb.faseb.org
fpwhite @ faseb.org
tleshan @ ascb.org
tlawless @ faseb.org
kwalsh @ aps.faseb.org
jwood @ faseb.org
mfrank @ aps.faseb.org
chancock @ asbmb.faseb.org
fpitlick @ pathol.faseb.org
rallison @ ain.faseb.org
mmhogan @ faseb.org
emarinco @ faseb.org
ccarrico @ faseb.org
olds @ faseb.org
newburgh @ faseb.org
ichow @ faseb.org
julia_janko @ sba.com
rkampman @ BIOPHYSICS.faseb.org
mstephens @ vsadc.com

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Dkorn@aamc.org@INET@LNGTWY (Dkorn@aamc.org@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-FEB-1998 18:35:37.00

SUBJECT: Heads Up

TO: Arthur Bienenstock@EOP (Arthur Bienenstock@EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Artie

I wanted to let you know that I am going to have to leave the AAMC committee meeting on Thursday shortly after noon to prepare to go to the airport. I am delivering a major address at a meeting on Friday in Toronto and must be at the opening events Thursday evening. So, you'll forgive me if I have to excuse myself before you are done.

Serious question: The AAMC is now the lead organization trying to block the legislative mishegas in the Senate. I have done nothing but human cloning for nearly 2 weeks now, and my desk shows it. Is there any way that we can get the Administration to back off its position on the desirability/need for legislation? As I've told you, the approach is very dangerous and would set a disastrous precedent. Look at the coalition of right-to-lifers around the awful Bond, Frist. Lott et allii bill!!! We've got
to stop this.

It would really help if the President could gracefully acknowledge the voluntary moratorium declared already by the major scientific/professional groups, reaffirm the FDA's authority to oversee/regulate this whole new technology, decide that the nation is sufficiently protected for now and declare a victory. That would really help!!

Please get back to me.========== ATTACHMENT 1 ==========
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
RFC-822-headers:
Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)
id <01IT6IT1TD1C00PUAM@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for "Arthur Bienenstock"@oa.eop.gov; Wed,

04 Feb 1998 11:48:28 -0500 (EST)
Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)
by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01IT6ISYJ7KG00A9XE@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for
Arthur_Bienenstock@oa.eop.gov; Wed, 04 Feb 1998 11:48:25 -0500 (EST)
Received: from aamc.org ([143.220.26.49]) by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)

with SMTP id <01IT6IS5X2KK0015PL@STORM.EOP.GOV> for
Arthur_Bienenstock@oa.eop.gov; Wed, 04 Feb 1998 11:47:46 -0500 (EST)

Received: from AAMC-Message_Server by aamc.org with Novell_GroupWise; Wed,
04 Feb 1998 11:43:58 -0500
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Content-disposition: inline
========== END ATTACHMENT 1 ==========

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: wraub@OSASPE.DHHS.GOV (wraub@OSASPE.DHHS.GOV [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-FEB-1998 20:08:36.00

SUBJECT: Re: fda jurisdiction over cloning -Reply -Reply

TO: nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU (nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Betty, Yes, our scope of interest includes "diagnostic tests for which there is no therapeutic remedy". In fact, the outside Task Force (mentioned in my earlier note) viewed such tests as candidates for "stringent scrutiny" -- especially if carried out for predictive purposes in large numbers of asymptomatic individuals.

Bill--Thank you very much for your response. In your closing paragraph, you state that the "regulation lite" approach would protect the public "from flawed tests and unscrupulous testers". This does/does not include diagnostic tests for which there is no therapeutic remedy? This is an area that concerns me greatly because I see in conversations with people that they assume the existence of a test for a genetic mutation includes a known therapy. Would your work group plan to address this as
well or does that remain an uncovered area? Thank you. Bette Kramer

>>> kramer <bkramers@worldnet.att.net> 02/02/98 04:25pm >>>
WILLIAM RAUB wrote:
>
> Note to Betty Kramer:
>
> In an exchange of comments with Alta, you wondered whether FDA has
> or might assert jurisdiction regarding genetic tests. The answer to both > is "yes".
>
> Under the medical-device statute, FDA now regulates those genetic tests
> that are packaged as kits. The process involved is essentially identical to
> the premarket review for other in-vitro diagnostic devices and is similar in
> many regards to the premarket review for drugs and biologics.
>
> To date, FDA has not exerted what it views as its latent authority (again
> via the device statute) to regulate those genetic tests that are offered as
> services but not packaged as kits (including the so-called "home
> brews"). That may change in the near future. In response in part to

the
> recommendations of a Task Force convened under the auspices of the
> Human Genome Project, the FDA later this year may issue a Notice of
> Proposed Rule-Making that, if subsequently enacted as a regulation,
> would make genetic-testing services as well as kits subject to FDA
> oversight.
>
> Further, any FDA action must occur within a larger context; for
regulation
> of genetic testing is a DHHS-wide issue. The primary reason is that, in
> addition to the FDA role, HCFA and CDC are involved through the
Clinical
> Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1992 (CLIA). In particular, the
> "analytic validity" of genetic tests offered by clinical laboratories
already
> is subject to CLIA-based rules.
>
> I chair an interagency work group within the DHHS to develop a
> "regulation lite" approach to the burgeoning field of genetic testing.
Our > goal is to effect a coordinated use of three extant authorities [
medical
> devices (FDA), clinical laboratories (CDC and HCFA), and
> human-subjects protection (NIH and FDA)] in a way that protects the
> public from flawed tests and unscrupulous testers while fostering
> continued research, development, evaluation, and commercialization in
> this area, which holds so much promise for medicine and health.
>
> Lily Engstrom and I would be pleased to discuss this further with you
> and other Commissioners if you would find that helpful.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-adhoc@aamcinfo.aamc.org@INET@LNGTWY (owner-adhoc@aamcinfo.aamc.org@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-FEB-1998 20:08:12.00

SUBJECT: Adhoc: Human Cloning

TO: Rachel E. Levinson@EOP (Rachel E. Levinson@EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Ad Hoc Group Email list serve.

In follow up to Sean's earlier email with the disclaimer that this is a communication mechanism and I am aware that the Ad Hoc Group has not addressed the issue of cloning:

I have just been informed that the Senate bill will be on the floor for deliberation and consideration tomorrow afternoon. Any information regarding the impact of proposed legislation needs to be articulated to Members of the Senate prior in the morning.

Marguerite Donoghue========== ATTACHMENT 1 ==========
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
RFC-822-headers:
Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)
id <01IT6WPE6GA800G1YQ@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for "Rachel E. Levinson"@oa.eop.gov; Wed,

04 Feb 1998 18:26:25 -0500 (EST)
Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)
by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01IT6WP2BXCG00983D@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for Rachel_E._Levinson@oa.eop.gov; Wed, 04 Feb 1998 18:26:08 -0500 (EST)
Received: from aamcinfo.aamc.org ([143.220.1.4])
by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)
with ESMTP id <01IT6WOENJUS001ESC@STORM.EOP.GOV> for Rachel_E._Levinson@oa.eop.gov; Wed, 04 Feb 1998 18:25:37 -0500 (EST)
Received: (from daemon@localhost) by aamcinfo.aamc.org (8.7.6/8.7.3)
id RAA07885 for adhoc-outgoing; Wed, 04 Feb 1998 17:58:50 -0500 (EST)
Received: from capitolink.com (capitolink.com [206.205.120.224])
by aamcinfo.aamc.org with ESMTP (8.7.6/8.7.3)
id RAA07876 for <adhoc@aamcinfo.aamc.org>; Wed,
04 Feb 1998 17:58:43 -0500 (EST)
Received: from maggie.capitolink.com (206.205.120.230)
by capitolink.com with SMTP (Eudora Internet Mail Server 1.2); Wed,
04 Feb 1998 18:06:09 -0500
Organization: Capitol Associates, Inc.
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.02 (Win95; I)
Precedence: bulk
========== END ATTACHMENT 1 ==========

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: bkramers@worldnet.att.net (bkramers@worldnet.att.net [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-FEB-1998 20:07:37.00

SUBJECT: Re: Your response to Alta's comments

TO: nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU (nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Alexander Capron wrote:
>
> On Tue, 13 Jan 1998, kramer wrote:
>
> > alta: it was not the foundation of my vote either and i distinctly
> > recall clarifying at the last session that such was the case for the
> > commission report. i wonder if steve was misquoted. bette
> >
>
> Bette:
>
> Good to see you last week. As I communicated on an earlier e-mail, I
> agree with Alta that the cloning report was not driven SOLELY by moral/
> ethical concerns other than safety but I don't take that to be what
Steve > was saying in the article that quoted him. Instead, I took the
gist to be
> simply that we didn't duck the ethical/social issues and rest our
> recommendation SOLELY on safety either. Indeed, the notion of the
> recommendation resting on two legs seems undeniable from the text of the
> NBAC report (as well as from my memory of the Commission's
deliberations, > but I don't expect the latter to be persuasive with
anyone). For example,
> we stated that in light of the unresolved "ethical and social concerns"
> about which debate was not yet resolved, we "therefore concluded that
> there should be imposed a period of time in which no attempt is made to
> create a child using somatic cell nuclear transfer" (Executive Summaryy,
> at p. iii of report) and "in addition to safety concerns, many other
> serious ethical concerns have been identified, which REQUIRE much more
> widespread and careful public deliberation before this technology MAY BE
> USED" (Conclusions and Recommendations #I, also p. iii; EMPHASIS mine).
>
> Of course, these kinds of conflicts are what keep historians employed!
> Alex
>
> **********
> * Alexander Morgan Capron *
> * University Professor of Law and Medicine *
> * Co-Director, Pacific Center for acapron@law.usc.edu *
> * Health Policy and Ethics (213) 740-2557 (voice) *
> * University of Southern California (213) 740-5502 (fax) *
> * Los Angeles, CA 90089-0071 (213) 740-0149 (fax)

* *
> **********
My memory of the deliberations is slightly different. I thought that our "consensus concern" was the safety issue. And that concern was so great that we called not only for the extension of the ban on federal funding but also called for legislation both to regulate in the private sector and to forestall multiple and differing state laws. Although not reported in the paper, my recollection is that there were many on the Commission who had grave concerns about proposing legislation and did so reluctantly for the above reasons. I also thought that re. the other issues, we were calling attention to the multiple issues that had been brought to our attention, and the varying reactions to them from all peoples including the Comm members, and that we were unable and unwilling to come to any conclusions based on any of those issues feeling that society, ourselves included, needed more time to ponder and that the five year moratorium would provide that opportunity. I guess the difference between my memory and Steve/Alex is that I thought we were quite clear IN OUR CONVERSATIONS that there was no consensus for making any decisions based on the other issues. Bette

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: wraub@OSASPE.DHHS.GOV (wraub@OSASPE.DHHS.GOV [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-FEB-1998 20:08:37.00

SUBJECT: Re: fda jurisdiction over cloning -Reply

TO: nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU (nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Note to Betty Kramer:

In an exchange of comments with Alta, you wondered whether FDA has or might assert jurisdiction regarding genetic tests. The answer to both is "yes".

Under the medical-device statute, FDA now regulates those genetic tests that are packaged as kits. The process involved is essentially identical to the premarket review for other in-vitro diagnostic devices and is similar in many regards to the premarket review for drugs and biologics.

To date, FDA has not exerted what it views as its latent authority (again via the device statute) to regulate those genetic tests that are offered as services but not packaged as kits (including the so-called "home brews"). That may change in the near future. In response in part to the recommendations of a Task Force convened under the auspices of the Human Genome Project, the FDA later this year may issue a Notice of Proposed Rule-Making that, if subsequently enacted as a regulation, would make genetic-testing services as well as kits subject to FDA oversight.

Further, any FDA action must occur within a larger context; for regulation of genetic testing is a DHHS-wide issue. The primary reason is that, in addition to the FDA role, HCFA and CDC are involved through the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1992 (CLIA). In particular, the "analytic validity" of genetic tests offered by clinical laboratories already is subject to CLIA-based rules.

I chair an interagency work group within the DHHS to develop a "regulation lite" approach to the burgeoning field of genetic testing. Our goal is to effect a coordinated use of three extant authorities [medical
devices (FDA), clinical laboratories (CDC and HCFA), and human-subjects protection (NIH and FDA)] in a way that protects the public from flawed tests and unscrupulous testers while fostering continued research, development, evaluation, and commercialization in this area, which holds so much promise for medicine and health.

Lily Engstrom and I would be pleased to discuss this further with you and other Commissioners if you would find that helpful.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-adhoc@aamcinfo.aamc.org@INET@LNGTWY (owner-adhoc@aamcinfo.aamc.org@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-FEB-1998 18:43:50.00

SUBJECT: Adhoc: Cloning Letter

TO: Rachel E. Levinson@EOP (Rachel E. Levinson@EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Note: We are using the Ad Hoc Group list serve to communicate this issue to you. Please note the Ad Hoc Group has not taken a position with regard to this legislation.

To: Organizations Interested in Medical Research

From: Dave Moore, Associate VP, Governmental Relations, AAMC

Subj: Cloning Letter

The AAMC is looking for organizations to sign the following letter to be sent to all Senators tomorrow afternoon. If your organization wishes to sign this letter, please contact me by fax [202-828-1125] or email [dbmoore@aamc.org]. The deadline for signing on is 1 p.m., Friday, Feb. 6.

Please distribute this letter to any organization you believe may be interested in this issue.

February 6, 1998

Dear Senator:

The current opportunities in biomedical research are unparalleled in our nation's history. To ensure that these continue, the scientific and organized medicine communities in the United States urge you to oppose legislation that would prohibit the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer due to the grave implications it may have for future advances in biomedical research and human healing.

We agree with the American public that the

cloning of human beings should not proceed at this time. However, the current legislative proposals in Congress would have a chilling effect on vital areas of research that could prove to be of enormous public benefit. Rather than legislation, we believe that the self-imposed five-year voluntary moratorium on the cloning of human beings, which has been adopted by the medical research community, is the appropriate course of action. This approach is the only way to ensure continued medical progress and to protect the public's interest.

We know a self-imposed moratorium works. In the early 1970s, the American public and the scientific community faced a similar dilemma with the emergence of recombinant DNA technology. At that time, the medical community adopted a self-imposed moratorium on the use of the technology until stringent guidelines and regulatory safeguards were put in place. With this deliberate approach, medical science has provided tremendous benefits over the last 20 years to the health and well being of all Americans, and our economy. Two shining examples of the benefits resulting from this technology are the mapping of the human genome and the growth of the biotechnology industry.

Like the recombinant DNA debate, the scientific techniques involved in cloning research hold great promise for our ability to ultimately treat and manage myriad diseases and disorders --from cancer and heart disease, to Parkinson's and Alzheimer's, to infertility and HIV/AIDS. We must not impede these research opportunities in our eagerness to forestall an outcome that can be accomplished just as effectively with a voluntary moratorium.

In addition to the research and medical communities' acceptance of a five-year moratorium on human cloning, we believe the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) existing authority to regulate any attempts to replicate human beings, and its announced intention to refuse consideration of such proposals, effectively protects the public. The FDA approval process is rigorous and has been duly tested over time. The self-imposed moratorium coupled with FDA's oversight is a strong combination.

We appreciate your concern and thank you for
your consideration of this important issue.

Sincerely,

Association of American Medical Colleges ========== ATTACHMENT 1
==========
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
RFC-822-headers:
Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)
id <01IT8B8XDXF400AOE0@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for "Rachel E. Levinson"@oa.eop.gov; Thu,

05 Feb 1998 18:33:47 -0500 (EST)
Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)
by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01IT8B8SW3SW00T4ID@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for
Rachel_E._Levinson@oa.eop.gov; Thu, 05 Feb 1998 18:33:42 -0500 (EST)
Received: from aamcinfo.aamc.org ([143.220.1.4])
by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)
with ESMTP id <01IT8B7XIMF4001EBZ@STORM.EOP.GOV> for
Rachel_E._Levinson@oa.eop.gov; Thu, 05 Feb 1998 18:33:00 -0500 (EST)
Received: (from daemon@localhost) by aamcinfo.aamc.org (8.7.6/8.7.3)
id SAA18726 for adhoc-outgoing; Thu, 05 Feb 1998 18:15:43 -0500 (EST)
Received: from aamc.org (wpo.aamc.org [143.220.26.49])
by aamcinfo.aamc.org with SMTP (8.7.6/8.7.3)
id SAA18717 for <adhoc@aamcinfo.aamc.org>; Thu,
05 Feb 1998 18:15:39 -0500 (EST)
Received: from AAMC-Message_Server by aamc.org with Novell_GroupWise; Thu,
05 Feb 1998 18:17:31 -0500
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Content-disposition: inline
Precedence: bulk
========== END ATTACHMENT 1 ==========

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Holly_L._Gwin@oa.eop.gov (Holly_L._Gwin@oa.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-FEB-1998 14:22:50.00

SUBJECT: [XOTA:524] Gibbons to Resign as Assistant to the President for Science and

TO: Multiple recipients of list <xota@itc.org> (Multiple recipients of list <xota@itc.org> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Message Creation Date was at 13-FEB-1998 14:08:00

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of Science and Technology Policy

For Immediate Release
February 13, 1998
Contact: 202/456-6108

Gibbons to Resign as Assistant to the President for Science and Technology

Dr. John H. (Jack) Gibbons, Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, announced today that he will resign next month from his White House post, and as Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP).

In a letter to President Clinton, Dr. Gibbons said "It has been an extraordinary honor and privilege to be your science advisor for over five years. I am grateful for the remarkable opportunity to cap my four decades of public service by serving you and our country. While I remain committed to your success, I believe that now is an appropriate time to submit my resignation, to be effective March 15, 1998. I look forward to continuing my efforts to build bridges between people, disciplines, and institutions."

Dr. Gibbons added, "I take my leave with a sense of deep humility and immense pride -- humility in being associated with great American scientists who have gone before me, pride in this nation!,s unmatched scientific establishment. The tools of science and technology have provided greater strength, greater resources, and a greater quality of life for all Americans. In private life, I will work as hard as I have in the White House to keep us on the path to

scientific preeminence, as well as to ensure that science and technology nurture the values and ideals that gave us birth as a Nation."

The President also announced his intention to nominate Dr. Neal Lane, currently Director of the National Science Foundation, to serve as his science
and technology advisor and Director of OSTP.

Dr. Gibbons delayed his departure plans for over a year to work with the President and the Vice President to identify his successor.

Today the President accepted his resignation with regret in a speech to the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He expressed his gratitude for Dr. Gibbons!, years of valuable service to the nation and for his
leadership in ensuring that America remains at the forefront of scientific capability.

Dr. Gibbons!, five years of experience in developing scientific consensus and
building bipartisan coalitions helped to produce pathbreaking developments in
the Clinton Administration, including:

- the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles, which is on track to produce a low-emissions, 80 mile per gallon car by 2004;

- science-based Stockpile Stewardship, which ensures the safety and reliability
of our nuclear stockpile without nuclear testing;

- the National Bioethics Advisory Commission, which has enabled a reasoned approach to divisive research issues such as the cloning of a human being; and

- expanding our international scientific partnerships, allowing us to draw on a
greater range of resources, while cost sharing major international research endeavors, such as the Large Hadron Collider.

Dr. Gibbons, one of the longest serving Presidential science advisors, came to
the White House in 1993. Prior to joining the Administration, Gibbons served
for 13 years as Director of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment.
Following his formal training in physics at Duke University, he spent 15 years
at Oak Ridge National Laboratory and at the University of Tennessee. Beginning
in 1970, he pioneered studies on how to use technology to produce and consume
energy more efficiently, while minimizing the environmental impacts.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Stiles, Skip" <Skip.Stiles@mail.house.gov> ("Stiles, Skip" <Skip.Stiles@mail.house.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-FEB-1998 17:11:00.00

SUBJECT: Capitol Hill - 84 days left

TO: "Stiles, Skip" <Skip.Stiles@mail.house.gov> ("Stiles, Skip" <Skip.Stiles@mail.house.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
We are in another quiet recess period, as distinct from our hard work renaming National Airport, acknowledging the importance of stay-at-home parents (H.Con.Res. 202), and engaging in other harrowing legislative debates. The longer-range legislative plans call for a cloning bill on the floor in early March (details to be arranged later), a Byrd-Hagel -type resolution on Kyoto in late March, NSF, NIST, commercial space, and NASA authorizations (if passed by the Senate) in late March, Internet obscenity in late March. After Easter recess, look for an NGI authorization on the floor, as well as an encryption bill, and an Internet gambling ban. This all comes from a Republican leadership document left in a copier, so I cannot provide any details....

We do know that the House and Senate staff are working on an NGI authorization. We also know that House Republican Science Committee staff are working on a DOE research reorganization bill of some kind. Other than that, the legislative front is clear.

Both the House Democratic and Republican legislative retreats earlier this week resulted in science and technology getting prominent mention in the resulting documents. So the slope this year does not seem as steep. However, the road-building caucus is aiming for the same pot of money, meaning that our work is cut out. And, we will still have to raise the discretionary caps in the budget if any additional money over this year's appropriated levels is to be available - and some conservatives are adamant about keeping the current caps in place. In addition, with the short year, the chances of a tobacco settlement are slim (unless the Leadership makes it a priority) meaning those additional revenues hang in the balance. So the work has just begun on getting R&D increases this year.

As always, pumping up the sometimes contrarian views of Mr. Brown, I point your browsers in the direction of a 2/2/98 speech he gave to the National Academy of Sciences' session on S&T and the national economic well-being.

http://www.house.gov/science_democrats/archive.htm#Speeches

Finally, a little note to those worried about where to find the offsets to pump up the 6.1 research accounts at the Department of Defense. My candidate is the $14 million US-Canadian program to convert US Cobra

Helicopters to look like Russian "Hokum" (I don't make these things up) attack helicopters so we can track and blow up the Hokums. The program was funded "based upon a threat analysis made several years ago," according to DOD. The Hokums are real bad and "there is no way our people can compete with it air-to-air," sez DOD.

But according to others in DOD, although the Hokums were supposed to be available for sale in 1992 they do not appear to be in production yet. In fact, DOD says, "There's no evidence to suggest even the Russians will ever have a Hokum because they don't have any money." When asked why this contract was going forward given these facts, an industry source said "We do it for industry-based reasons." Hokum.

Well, gotta go and catch the three-day weekend, for recreation-based reasons.

Skip Stiles
Democratic Legislative Director
House Committee on Science
822 OHOB
Washington, DC 20515

(202) 225-8483
(202) 2260983 (fax)

committee home page - http://www.house.gov/science_democrats/

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Meslin, Eric" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> ("Meslin, Eric" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-MAR-1998 17:51:47.00

SUBJECT: Quick Update

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Dear Members, et al:

With the Commission schedule switching to bi-monthly meetings, I want to ensure
that you are all kept fully up to date on our activities. I suspect that while
May 19-20 may seem a long way off, it isn't.

Here then is a short status report.

1. Transcripts from our recent meeting should be available by the end of this
week, and they will be made available to you.

2. Final details of the May meeting in Cleveland will be sent shortly.

3. Two writing buckets have been formed, to work with staff in bringiing the
reports on human biological materials and on disorders affecting decision making
capacity closer to completion. The writing buckets include:

HBM: Murray, Charo, Grieder, Cox, Holtzman (and Hanna)
Capacity: Childress, Backlar, Flynn, Cassell (and Moreno)

Staff will be centrally involved in each, and I will join both writing buckets.

All commissioners will have input into these reports, so even if you aren't specifically involved in a bucket, we hope you'll actively provide your views.
We are hoping, for example, to be able to produce the next version of the staff
drafts for both reports within a month, and then circulate these drafts (at least) to Commissioners for comments and suggested revisions. Conference calls
for both buckets have been scheduled for this week. I will provide a briefing
on the status of the writing buckets thereafter.

I'll provide more information relating to the international project in a later
email.

Best regards,

Eric

Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
Executive Director
National Bioethics Advisory Commission
6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
Tel: (301) 402-4242
Fax: (301) 480-6900
Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tom Murray <thm2@po.cwru.edu> (Tom Murray <thm2@po.cwru.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-MAR-1998 04:54:38.00

SUBJECT: Re: NY Times

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Who is this Jones guy and why is he writing such dumb things?

Tom

At 01:49 PM 3/17/98 -0800, you wrote:
>NBACers:
>
>I only got around to seeing Saturday's NYTimes OpEd on cloning yesterday
>afternoon. FYI, here's the letter I sent to the Times today, but with the
>speed of communications being what it is, I now see they have three very
>good letters in today's paper.
>
>Best, Alex
>----------
>To the Editor:
>
> Steve Jones' lively but ill-informed objections to any
>restrictions on human cloning ("Arguing Ethics, Forfeiting Progress,"
>Op-ed, March 14), ascribes a number of ridiculous ideas to "ethicists,"
>who, we are told, would have kept "transplant pioneers" from "getting
>away" with the audacious act of saving lives of the "only just alive" with
>hearts donated from "the scarcely dead" thirty years ago if ethicists then
>had the power they wield today. As a member of the only ethics group he
>identifies by name, the National Bioethics Advisory Commission (NBAC), and
>as co-author of the statute that in most states makes it possible to
>declare bodies without brain functions dead (and hence eligible for
>transplantation), may I be permitted to object to his characterization?
>
> Prof. Jones notwithstanding, the time-limited moratorium on
>creating children by cloning proposed by NBAC would do nothing to prevent
>scientists from cloning DNA, molecules, or cells, all of which, as he
>notes, are now common activities of biologists. Nor would it stand in the
>way of attempts at "copying organs or tissues," just of trying to do this
>by creating a fetus for implantation in a uterus and eventual birth.
>
> Despite Jones' suggestion that NBAC is "now considering such
>issues," we actually presented our report to President CLinton last June.
>In it, we debunked the notion that genetic uniqueness is essential for
>human identity, moral worth, or legal rights. We argued against what
>Jones terms genetic essentialism, though we noted that the false belief of

>prospective parents that they could determine their children's
>characteristics and lives through their choice of DNA would not only
>deprive the children of their moral right to an open future and lead to
>eugenic policies but also produce horrible backlash when the parental
>expectations were disappointed.
>
> The basic argument in favor of a moratorium is the need to keep
>fertility centers and others not dependent on government funding (which is
>unavailable) from rushing ahead in an unduly risky attempt to create
>babies using the technique that produced Dolly. By the time animal
>research makes the risks less extreme, we should have had further national
>debate on the social, ethical, and legal issues that NBAC reviewed but did
>not resolve in the limited time available for our report.
>
>
>Alexander M. Capron
>University Professor of Law and Medicine
>Co-Director, Pacific Center for Health Policy and Ethics
>University of Southern California
>
>
>
>
>

Thomas H. Murray, Ph.D.
Center for Biomedical Ethics
Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine
10900 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44106-4976
Phone: 216-368-6206
Fax: 216-368-8713
Email: thm2@po.cwru.edu

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Trish Backlar <TRISH@NH1.NH.PDX.EDU> (Trish Backlar <TRISH@NH1.NH.PDX.EDU> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-MAR-1998 04:54:47.00

SUBJECT: Steve Jones

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Hello colleagues,
The article I read by Steve Jones was not in the TLS but in the Manchester Guardian Weekly. The date is June 22 1997, p. 31 and the title: "Genes V Genesis." He writes: "This month's ban on human cloning (admittedly one with some carefully crafted loopholes) by President Clinton's committee shows what happens when science and belief overlap. He has taken the fundamentalist position." The "he" refers to Clinton. If you are burning to read this article I'll fax a xeroxed copy to the NBAC office. And yes, he is Professor of Genetics at University College London.
Trish

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Meslin, Eric" <MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV> ("Meslin, Eric" <MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-MAR-1998 04:55:36.00

SUBJECT: RE: and the winner is:

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
What a wonderful tutorial.

Eric

p.s., Although some but not all have requested copies oif the nature paper
and
letters, I've taken the liberty of having copies faxed to all of you.

Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
Executive Director
National Bioethics Advisory Commission
6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
Tel: (301) 402-4242
Fax: (301) 480-6900
Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
http://www.bioethics.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: rlevinso@OSTP.EOP.GOV [SMTP:rlevinso@OSTP.EOP.GOV]
Sent: Friday, March 13, 1998 4:25 PM
To: NBAC Members E-list
Subject: RE: and the winner is:

Bill and Alex- you're right in pointing out another of many
problems in
this article. Although they didn't say that Dolly was created
using an
adult cell, they did say that this was the first time cloning had
been
done
using "a somatic cell, which is not related to reproductive
functions,
to
clone a calf." This could be read in one of two ways: (1)
somatic
cells
are not related to reproductive functions, which is true but then
one

can still conclude that both Dolly and Marguerite were created from somatic cells; or (2) Marguerite was created from a somatic cell of non-reproductive origin, while Dolly was created from an udder cell, which the author strangely interprets as being related to reproduction.

In any case, the Marguerite progenitor cell was a fetus, which distinguishes her from Dolly, but not from Holly and Belle and Megan and Morag and who knows how many other animals whose nuclei donor cells came from fetuses. Certainly all of these animals preceded Marguerite in demonstrating that somatic cells could be used to create a healthy clone.

Finally, the fact that the cell came from a fetus does not mean that it was not a fully-differentiated somatic cell. Without knowing the gestation period of a cow, I would still assume that it would be pretty simple to obtain recognizable muscle cells from a 60-day fetus.

There - we're done and you all win M&M's

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: alta charo <racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu> (alta charo <racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:26-MAR-1998 13:58:59.00

SUBJECT: fyi

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
MAGAZINES & JOURNALS

A glance at today's issue of "The New England Journal of Medicine": A ban on human cloning would be misguided

Never before has Congress passed legislation to halt a single kind of scientific or medical research, so any plan to ban research on cloning human cells would be unprecedented, and seriously misguided, writes Jerome P. Kassirer, the journal's editor in chief, and Nadia A. Rosenthal, a consultant in molecular medicine at the journal. Research on somatic-cell nuclear transfer, as a cloning technique is called, may yield numerous benefits, including valuable information on the causes of cancer or aging. But given public concerns about cloning, the two scientists write, lawmakers should study the discussions that surrounded possible restrictions on DNA research, which was similarly controversial in the 1970s. Heading off legislation to ban that research, scientists worked with lawmakers to develop guidelines and standards. The two scientists conclude that at one extreme, the cloning of human cells conjures up images of deformed babies, while at the other are promises of curing diseases and infertility. The truth probably lies somewhere in between, and it's up to scientists to make that clear to the public, they say. (The journal's World-Wide Web address is http://www.nejm.org)

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Meslin, Eric" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> ("Meslin, Eric" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-APR-1998 18:09:32.00

SUBJECT: Report Update

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Dear Commisioners:

In a previous email I optimistically informed you that we hoped to have the staff drafts of our two ongoing reports in hand by April 15, and would be sending them out at that time. Both the staff and writing buckets are working hard on these drafts, but will not, regrettably, have them in hand by tomorrow.
My more realistic goal is to receive them early next week. We will send them out as soon as we get them. Naturally, if one is completed before the other, we will send it along first.

I'm sorry for any inconvenience this may cause, particularly if you had intended to block time the rest of this week (or the weekend) to review and provide comments. This slightly later schedule was accounted for in my timetable; so long as we can get materials to you next week, and give you a week or so to get comments back to us, we will be able to revise the draft in sufficient time to put them in the briefing books (and on the web) during the first week of May.

Eric

Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
Executive Director
National Bioethics Advisory Commission
6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
Tel: (301) 402-4242
Fax: (301) 480-6900
Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
http://www.bioethics.gov

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: rhetaugh@umich.edu (Rhetaugh Dumas) (rhetaugh@umich.edu (Rhetaugh Dumas) [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-APR-1998 10:13:12.00

SUBJECT: Re: Report Update

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Eric, I can get you my comments after May 1. April is an extremely busy month for me (traveling, etc.) Rhetaugh

>Dear Commisioners:
>
>In a previous email I optimistically informed you that we hoped to have the
>staff drafts of our two ongoing reports in hand by April 15, and would be
>sending them out at that time. Both the staff and writing buckets are working
>hard on these drafts, but will not, regrettably, have them in hand by tomorrow.
>My more realistic goal is to receive them early next week. We will send
>them out
>as soon as we get them. Naturally, if one is completed before the other,
>we will
>send it along first.
>
>I'm sorry for any inconvenience this may cause, particularly if you had
>intended
>to block time the rest of this week (or the weekend) to review and provide
>comments. This slightly later schedule was accounted for in my timetable; so
>long as we can get materials to you next week, and give you a week or so to get
>comments back to us, we will be able to revise the draft in sufficient time to
>put them in the briefing books (and on the web) during the first week of May.
>
>Eric
>
>
>Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
>Executive Director
>National Bioethics Advisory Commission
>6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
>Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
>Tel: (301) 402-4242
>Fax: (301) 480-6900

>Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
>http://www.bioethics.gov

Rhetaugh G. Dumas, PhD, RN, FAAN
Vice Provost Emerita
Dean Emerita and Lucille Cole Professor of Nursing
400 N. Ingalls, Room 4320
Ann Arbor MI 48109-0482
313/936-6213
Fax 313/647-9325

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> ("Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-APR-1998 10:24:50.00

SUBJECT: RE: Report Update

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Thanks Rhetaugh. It may turn out that your comments are arriving at about the
time we are planning to send out the revised version of the draft in the briefing books. If the timing is right, your comments will obvioiusly be included. If the timing doesn;t work out, pleae ensure that you send them anyway, and bring them to the meeting. The staff draft is not the last word on
the document by any means.

Eric

Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
Executive Director
National Bioethics Advisory Commission
6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
Tel: (301) 402-4242
Fax: (301) 480-6900
Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
http://www.bioethics.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: rhetaugh@umich.edu [SMTP:rhetaugh@umich.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 1998 11:10 AM
To: NBAC Members E-list
Subject: Re: Report Update

Eric, I can get you my comments after May 1. April is an extremely busy
month for me (traveling, etc.) Rhetaugh

>Dear Commisioners:
>
>In a previous email I optimistically informed you that we hoped to have
the
>staff drafts of our two ongoing reports in hand by April 15, and would

be
>sending them out at that time. Both the staff and writing
buckets are
working
>hard on these drafts, but will not, regrettably, have them in
hand by
tomorrow.
>My more realistic goal is to receive them early next week. We
will send
>them out
>as soon as we get them. Naturally, if one is completed before the
other,
>we will
>send it along first.
>
>I'm sorry for any inconvenience this may cause, particularly if
you had
>intended
>to block time the rest of this week (or the weekend) to review and
provide
>comments. This slightly later schedule was accounted for in my
timetable; so
>long as we can get materials to you next week, and give you a
week or
so to get
>comments back to us, we will be able to revise the draft in
sufficient
time to
>put them in the briefing books (and on the web) during the first
week
of May.
>
>Eric
>
>
>Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
>Executive Director
>National Bioethics Advisory Commission
>6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
>Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
>Tel: (301) 402-4242
>Fax: (301) 480-6900
>Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
>http://www.bioethics.gov

Rhetaugh G. Dumas, PhD, RN, FAAN
Vice Provost Emerita
Dean Emerita and Lucille Cole Professor of Nursing
400 N. Ingalls, Room 4320
Ann Arbor MI 48109-0482
313/936-6213
Fax 313/647-9325

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> ("Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-APR-1998 13:14:35.00

SUBJECT: Update on drafts....and other matters

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Dear Commissioners and others:

1. The staff drafts of the capacity and human biological materials reports will be in our hands by Wednesday. We will send them out to you by fedex, and they should arrive in your hands by Friday. If possible, please send us your comments at your earliest convenience. Once we have these comments, we will incorporate them into the next version of the drafts, and will place these in the briefing books, (and on the web).

2. You will have received the draft agenda for the Cleveland meeting from Pat Norris. We have now confirmed the final speaker for Tuesday morning Dr. Marjorie Speers, Deputy SAssociaet Director for Science, Centers for Disease Control and . A final agenda for the entire meeting will be sent with your briefing books.

I should note that Dr. Speers is one of several new "liaisions" to NBAC from various federal agencies and departments. I requested that such liaisons be identified in a March letter of introduction to department and agency heads, as a way to increase communication between NBAC and the agencies.

3. International activities. A number of things have been happening, and here is a short update.

a) Alex and I have been working on a revised draft of issues NBAC may wish to consider when it continues its discussion of possible topics for its international research report. You will receive the next version in your briefing book, and we will discuss this at the meeting in Cleveland. The

purpose
of the draft we are preparing is to stimulate discussion and comment; it
is not
the last word.

b) Alex and I also have been at work developing a proposal for the 2nd International Summit of Bioethics Commissions, to be held in conjunction with
the 4th World Congress of Bioethics (International Association of Bioethics), in
Tokyo (November 1998). I will forward this draft proposal to all commissioners
shortly. Currently, we are awaiting word from the Japanese organizers as to whether this proposal (co-sponsored by France) will be workable. It is intended
to build on the success of the San Francisco Summit that many of you attended in
1996. More details about how many commissioners may be able to participate,
(and with what funding arrangements) will be provided at a later date.

4. The 1996-97 NBAC Annual Report has now been completed and printed. We will
send to each of you a number of copies (25 to start). The Report will also be
available on our website. If more hard copies are needed we can get them to you
as well. I expect that the final Cloning Report will be in our hands shortly.

More later.

Eric

Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
Executive Director
National Bioethics Advisory Commission
6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
Tel: (301) 402-4242
Fax: (301) 480-6900
Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
http://www.bioethics.gov

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: cmcphaul@aaas.org (CMCPHAUL) (cmcphaul@aaas.org (CMCPHAUL) [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-APR-1998 19:00:45.00

SUBJECT: Invitation to the AIBS Biology Roundtable on Cloning

TO: "+dist+~peha ("+dist+~peha/public/AAAS.dl"@andrew.cmu.edu [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
I apologize in being late with this invitation from AIBS, but thought it
may be of interest to some of you; Jodi Kolber says there is still room,
but to call asap if you wish to attend...

PLEASE RSVP TO AIBS COMMUNICATIONS REPRESENTATIVE JODI KOLBER AT
JKOLBER@AIBS.ORG, PHONE 202/628-1500, EXT. 253, OR FAX 202/628-1509.

The American Institute of Biological Sciences cordially invites you or a
representative for you to attend the AIBS BIOLOGY ROUNDTABLE ON CLONING

APRIL 22, 1998 at the National Press Club FIRST AMENDMENT ROOM
National Press Building, 14th and F Streets, NW, 202/662-7500
12:00 pm to 3:00 pm
Lunch will be served at this event.

The AIBS Biology Roundtable Series provides a non-partisan public forum for
discussion of important scientific issues and their place in societal
affairs. The Biology Roundtable on Cloning proposes a balanced but vigorous
discussion of the science behind current cloning techniques for various
mammalian species, the potential benefits of cloning to medical and
agricultural applications, and the potential ethical and regulatory
concerns
cloning may engender.

Panelists will include:

David Magnus, PhD
Graduate Studies Director
Center for Bioethics
University of Pennsylvania

Kenneth F. Schaffner, MD, PhD
University Professor of Medical Humanities
Professor of Philosophy
George Washington University

Colin Stewart, PhD
Director of Cancer and
Developmental Biology Lab
NCI-Frederick Cancer Research
and Development Center

Kevin Wildes, SJ, PhD
Associate Director
Kennedy Institute of Ethics
Associate Professor of Philosophy
Georgetown University

LIMITED ATTENDANCE WILL BE FILLED ON A FIRST COME, FIRST SERVED BASIS.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Alexander Capron <acapron@law.usc.edu> (Alexander Capron <acapron@law.usc.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-APR-1998 19:52:37.00

SUBJECT: NYRB

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
The latest issue of the NY Review of Books has a review by Steve Jones (genetics prof at University College London, and the person who had some rather misleading things to say in a recent NYTimes OpEd) of Kolata's book Clone, Rifkin's Biotech Century, and EO Wilson's Consilience; as in his other peice, this is a "good read" (the usual clever, biting British style of criticism, with allusions to, and bits of info from, many fields thrown in); he manages to suggest that anyone with worries or concerns about any matters genetic (which includes cloning) will come to feel rather silly about those concerns as we all get used to the changes, which will be more modest than Kolata suggests, less horrible than Rifkin predicts, and less morally grounded than Wilson would have it.

Alex

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Alex Capron <acapron@law.usc.edu> (Alex Capron <acapron@law.usc.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-MAY-1998 11:37:37.00

SUBJECT: RE: A Modest Proposal

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Eric:
Yes to both.
Alex

On Tue, 5 May 1998, Meslin, Eric (OD) wrote:

> We have obtained original copies of the Belmont Report and the Human Subjects
> Regulations. We can easily insert these into your briefing books, since they are
> not large documents. We have also obtained copies of the OPRR Guidebook
> (without the binders). These are large documents; so please indicate whether
> you'd like to receive one. We can send them out under separate cover.
>
> Eric
>
> Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
> Executive Director
> National Bioethics Advisory Commission
> 6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
> Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
> Tel: (301) 402-4242
> Fax: (301) 480-6900
> Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
> http://www.bioethics.gov
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Alexander Capron [SMTP:acapron@law.usc.edu]
> Sent: Monday, May 04, 1998 6:04 PM
> To: NBAC Members E-list
> Subject: A Modest Proposal
>
> Eric:
> I make the following request knowing that:
> 1. At some time in the past we all received the current "Common Rule"
> and other regulations;
> 2. None of us needs any more paper flooding our homes/offices,

>
> BUT, that said, it would useful for me to have a complete and legible
> (ie
> not xeroxed from the Federal Register?) version of the human subject
> regulations to bring with me to each meeting as a reference work (rather
> the way Hugo Black used to carry a paperback copy of the constitution
> with
> him at all times), and perhaps this could be included when you send the
> analysis you just mentioned working out with OPRR on how the existing
> regs
> address research using human tissues.
>
> I don't intend this to be a major chore for the staff to produce: OPRR
> probably has such a booklet. (BTW, I'd also like to see a copy of their
> current version of the "Official IRB Guidebook.") I do think it will be
> useful, at least for me; if other Commissioners don't want it, perhaps
> they should indicate to you not to bother sending them a copy, to save
> another tree!
>
> Thanks,
> Alex
>
>

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> ("Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-MAY-1998 11:40:13.00

SUBJECT: RE: genetics as (not) different

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
If it will help...
Staff has been working on several different visual aids that may help in bringing some of the discussion to closure. One of these is a flow chart, modeled after OPRR's decision tree (helpfully distributed and edited by Alta two meetings ago). This decision tree should help to put any of the commission's potential recommendations in perspective. Staff is also developing a set of Q's and A's that could be included in the HBM report that we think might answer FAQ's (frequently asked questions) by IRBs, investigators, research subjects, and repositories. We will gladly send this diagram out in the revised draft, or under separate cover if we feel that it is still in a work-in-progress-mode.

The second diagram staff has been developing, along the lines that Carol (and Larry) have been requesting, is one that simply shows what the current regulations say about research use of tissue, where certain ambiguities exist, and where they are (possibly) silent. Such a diagram has been initially been vetted by OPRR, but will be more directly vetted by them at a meeting Gary Ellis and I have convened with our staffs for next week. This document certainly won't be in the revised drafts going out in the briefing books, but commissioners will have them prior to the meeting.

Eric

Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
Executive Director
National Bioethics Advisory Commission
6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01

Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
Tel: (301) 402-4242
Fax: (301) 480-6900
Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
http://www.bioethics.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: lhmiike@mail.health.state.hi.us [SMTP:lhmiike@mail.health.state.hi.us]
Sent: Monday, May 04, 1998 4:11 PM
To: NBAC Members E-list
Subject: Re: genetics as (not) different

Steve Holtzman wrote:
>
> larry:
> in your mind, will our recommendations vis a vis research on biological
> materials pertain to genetic research or all research? if the former, how
> do you avoid the issue?
> -steve
> At 10:07 AM 5/1/98 -1000, you wrote:
> >While I find the discussion interesting, let's not forget that the issue
> >is not essential to our biological materials report. If we mention it
> >at all, I would restrict it to only identifying (and not extensively
> >analyzing) the issues concerning different or not. We need to get to
> >closure on the report, as well as the capacity report. NBAC has
> >produced no products except for our quick cloning report, and the senate
> >already has claim to the title of the world's most deliberative body.
> >larry
> >
> >
> >
> Steven H. Holtzman
> Chief Business Officer
> Millennium Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
> 238 Main Street
> Cambridge, MA 02142
> Tel: 617 679-7219 Fax: 617 621-0264
> E-Mail: holtzman@mpi.com
steve: in all of our (neverending) discussions on the use of human biological materials, we have addressed all research on such materials,

not just genetics research. I have not heard an iota of discussion that
our report would have separate recommendations for genetics research and
for other types of research (e.g., aids/hiv research).
On another point, I agree with carol that we need to match up our many
previous discussions with chapter 6's "current guidance..." -- i.e., how
our recommendations can be accomodated within such current guidelines
and where they cannot, how the guidelines or our recommendations have to
be revised. I will try later this week to state (briefly) what I have
concluded from our previous discussions. On this point, Buchanan's
continued use of the phrase "blanket consent" irks me -- we have never
seriously considered this, and it is a false dichotomy. But more on
this later. My state -- which has the worse economy in the nation -- is
currently about to go into overtime for the legislative session -- and
my budget is one of the key issues caught in the middle between the
house and senate. I hope this gets resolved by this Thursday.
larry

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: kramer <bkramers@worldnet.att.net> (kramer <bkramers@worldnet.att.net> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-MAY-1998 11:38:27.00

SUBJECT: Re: A Modest Proposal

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Meslin, Eric (OD) wrote:
>
> We have obtained original copies of the Belmont Report and the Human Subjects
> Regulations. We can easily insert these into your briefing books, since they are
> not large documents. We have also obtained copies of the OPRR Guidebook
> (without the binders). These are large documents; so please indicate whether
> you'd like to receive one. We can send them out under separate cover.
>
> Eric
>
> Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
> Executive Director
> National Bioethics Advisory Commission
> 6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
> Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
> Tel: (301) 402-4242
> Fax: (301) 480-6900
> Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
> http://www.bioethics.gov
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Alexander Capron [SMTP:acapron@law.usc.edu]
> Sent: Monday, May 04, 1998 6:04 PM
> To: NBAC Members E-list
> Subject: A Modest Proposal
>
> Eric:
> I make the following request knowing that:
> 1. At some time in the past we all received the current "Common Rule"
> and other regulations;
> 2. None of us needs any more paper flooding our homes/offices,
>
> BUT, that said, it would useful for me to have a complete and legible
> (ie

> not xeroxed from the Federal Register?) version of the human subject
> regulations to bring with me to each meeting as a reference work (rather
> the way Hugo Black used to carry a paperback copy of the constitution
> with
> him at all times), and perhaps this could be included when you send the
> analysis you just mentioned working out with OPRR on how the existing
> regs
> address research using human tissues.
>
> I don't intend this to be a major chore for the staff to produce: OPRR
> probably has such a booklet. (BTW, I'd also like to see a copy of their
> current version of the "Official IRB Guidebook.") I do think it will be
> useful, at least for me; if other Commissioners don't want it, perhaps
> they should indicate to you not to bother sending them a copy, to save
> another tree!
>
> Thanks,
> Alex

Eric--Is it possible you/staff can insert relevant pieces of guidebook in briefing materials as needed?

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Carol Greider <cgreider@bs.jhmi.edu> (Carol Greider <cgreider@bs.jhmi.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-MAY-1998 11:37:47.00

SUBJECT: Re: Gene Patenting

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
>Mark Sagoff has an informative article on "Patented Genes: An Ethical
>Appraisal" in the latest ISSUES IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (Spring 1998,
>pp. 37-41); and MOTHER JONES has several articles "inside the
>biotechnology revolution" in its June 1998 issue, including an excerpt
>from Jeremy Rifkin's THE BIOTECH CENTURY (which Steven Jones savaged in
>his article about cloning etc. in a recent NYRev Books, as I mentioned
>earlier), and an article focusing on the genome mapping in Iceland by a
firm
>called deCode Genetics (as in deliver deCode deSooner deBetter?) by Eliot
>Marshall.
>
>I was sent a copy of MOTHER JONES with an encouragement to write a letter
>to the editor; did it come to me as a Commissioner? Did we all get one?
>If not, perhaps staff could obtain & duplicate for the Commission;
>likewise, distribute the Sagoff article??
>

Alex,

I also got the letter from Mother Jones with the copy of the journal- I
have not had time to compose a letter in responce as they invited, but I'm
considering it.

I did however check out Steven Jones assertion from his article
" type Rifkin into the web and you come up with Luddite "

He is right I did the experiment!

Carol

****

Carol W. Greider, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine
617 Hunterian Building
725 N. Wolfe Street
Baltimore, MD 21205

Phone: (410) 614-6506
Fax (410) 614-2987
e-mail: cgreider@bs.jhmi.edu
****

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tom Murray <thm2@po.cwru.edu> (Tom Murray <thm2@po.cwru.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-MAY-1998 11:39:10.00

SUBJECT: RE: tom's chapter

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
By copy of this message I will ask Judy to send you a coy of the chapter.

Tom

At 11:10 AM 5/1/98 -0400, you wrote:
>Tom:
>
>Before I rush out and buy Mark's book, o you have one of your own? If you
can
>get your chapter copied, we'd be delighted to send it to Commissioners. If
not,
>I'll stick with my to get it.
>
>Eric
>
>Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
>Executive Director
>National Bioethics Advisory Commission
>6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
>Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
>Tel: (301) 402-4242
>Fax: (301) 480-6900
>Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
>http://www.bioethics.gov
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Tom Murray [SMTP:thm2@po.cwru.edu]
> Sent: Thursday, April 30, 1998 11:04 AM
> To: NBAC Members E-list
> Subject: Re: tom's chapter
>
> Alta,
>
> Thanks for your response. I'll talk with Eric about getting the
chapter
> distributed. I don't harbor any illusions about it being the
last word,
> but it might be a fruitful way of moving the discussion forward.
>
> Tom

>
> At 07:41 AM 4/30/98 -0700, you wrote:
> >
> >perhaps it would be easier to see your discussion on this point
if
> >you could have a copy of the chapter distributed, at least to
those
> >of us still developing views on this. thanks much.
> >
> >second, the public policy question of whether genetics should be
> >treated differently is somewhat different that whether genetic
> >information is different. while public policy discussion should
be
> >based on good facts, of course, the policy choices are often made
> >for reasons (such as civic peace, public confidence in government
> >etc) that go beyond the facts. ex: AIDS is just another
> >infectious disease, a number of which are frequently lethal, but
> >the public attitudes about it were so extreme and so influenced
by
> >attitudes towards those in the high risk groups that special
rules
> >were adopted about transmission and use of HIV infection
information.
> >
> >thus, for me there are two unresolved questions: is genetic info
> >different? even if not, as a matter of policy should it be
treated
> >as if it were different?
> >
> >
> >
> >At 10:08 AM 30-04-98 -0400, you wrote:
> >>A quick response to Alta's comment on genetics as special:
Having
> >just
> >>presented a seminar to Zeke's ethics crew at NIH, where this
issue
> >came up
> >>once again, I remain convinced that genetic exceptionalism is
for
> >the most
> >>part a manifestation of genetic determinism and genetic
> >reductionism, and
> >>the less of all of them the better. My best statement of the
> >argument
> >>against exceptionalism is my chapter in Mark Rothstein's new
book
> >"Genetic
> >>Secrets." I would appreciate it if anyone wants to point out
the
> >errors in
> >>the argument I make there.
> >>
> >>Tom

> >>
> >>At 11:14 PM 4/29/98 -0700, you wrote:
> >>>a short coda to the last email, on whether genetic info is
> >>>different from other medical info.
> >>>
> >>>not having been on the subcomm, i wasn't part of these
discussions.
> >>> perhaps that is why i am not yet persuaded that genetic info
is
> >>>unremarkable. while it is true that each of its salient
aspects
> >>>are represented in other forms of info (infectious diseases
can be
> >>>transmitted horizontally within a generation and vertically
across
> >>>generations via gestation; presymptomatic cancer (e.g.
prostate)
> >>>can be a basis for health insurance discrimination; particular
> >>>illnesses (such as sexually transmitted diseases) can be
socially
> >>>stigmatizing and affect reproductive planning; etc. but
genetic
> >>>information uniquely implicates all these characteristics
> >>>simultaneously. in addition, history has created a uniquely
> >>>important place for genetics in our public policy. it also has
> >>>been viewed as central to many theological discussions of real
> >>>importance to members of the public. for all these reasons, i
am
> >>>still of the opinion that this kind of information deserves
special
> >>>attention to prevent its misuse.
> >>>
> >>>that said, i also believe that tissue and the genetic and other
> >>>information it contains is simply another form of a medical
record;
> >>>here the information is encoded in dna strands or the presence
of
> >>>viruses, as opposed to the bits and bytes of computerized
records,
> >>>or the pen and ink of paper records. seen this way, there is
> >>>reason to consider a somewhat more unified approach to
clinical and
> >>>research use of all forms of medical records, whether
paper-based,
> >>>computer-based, or tissue-based, and to the rules governing the
> >>>confidentiality of all these forms of information.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>_____
> >>>r. alta charo, j.d.
> >>>senior fellow, stanford center for biomedical ethics
> >>>701a welch road, suite 1105
> >>>palo alto, ca 94304
> >>>650-723-5760 (tel)

> >>>650-725-6131 (fax)
> >>>415-661-9987 (home)
> >>>racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >>_____
> >_____
> >>Thomas H. Murray, Ph.D.
> >>Center for Biomedical Ethics
> >>Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine
> >>10900 Euclid Avenue
> >>Cleveland, OH 44106-4976
> >>Phone: 216-368-6206
> >>Fax: 216-368-8713
> >>Email: thm2@po.cwru.edu
> >>
> >>
> >
> >
> >_____
> >r. alta charo, j.d.
> >senior fellow, stanford center for biomedical ethics
> >701a welch road, suite 1105
> >palo alto, ca 94304
> >650-723-5760 (tel)
> >650-725-6131 (fax)
> >415-661-9987 (home)
> >racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu
> >
> >
> >
>
>
>_____
> Thomas H. Murray, Ph.D.
> Center for Biomedical Ethics
> Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine
> 10900 Euclid Avenue
> Cleveland, OH 44106-4976
> Phone: 216-368-6206
> Fax: 216-368-8713
> Email: thm2@po.cwru.edu
>
>
>

_____

Thomas H. Murray, Ph.D.
Center for Biomedical Ethics
Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine
10900 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44106-4976

Phone: 216-368-6206
Fax: 216-368-8713
Email: thm2@po.cwru.edu

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: lhmiike@mail.health.state.hi.us (Miike, Lawrence H. (Kinau Hale (lhmiike@mail.health.state.hi.us (Miike, Lawrence H. (Kinau Hale / DO)) [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-MAY-1998 11:38:31.00

SUBJECT: Re: genetics as (not) different

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Steve Holtzman wrote:
>
> larry:
> in your mind, will our recommendations vis a vis research on biological
> materials pertain to genetic research or all research? if the former,
how
> do you avoid the issue?
> -steve
> At 10:07 AM 5/1/98 -1000, you wrote:
> >While I find the discussion interesting, let's not forget that the issue
> >is not essential to our biological materials report. If we mention it
> >at all, I would restrict it to only identifying (and not extensively
> >analyzing) the issues concerning different or not. We need to get to
> >closure on the report, as well as the capacity report. NBAC has
> >produced no products except for our quick cloning report, and the senate
> >already has claim to the title of the world's most deliberative body.
> >larry
> >
> >
> >
> Steven H. Holtzman
> Chief Business Officer
> Millennium Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
> 238 Main Street
> Cambridge, MA 02142
> Tel: 617 679-7219 Fax: 617 621-0264
> E-Mail: holtzman@mpi.com
steve: in all of our (neverending) discussions on the use of human biological materials, we have addressed all research on such materials, not just genetics research. I have not heard an iota of discussion that our report would have separate recommendations for genetics research and for other types of research (e.g., aids/hiv research).
On another point, I agree with carol that we need to match up our many previous discussions with chapter 6's "current guidance..." -- i.e., how our recommendations can be accomodated within such current guidelines and where they cannot, how the guidelines or our recommendations have to be revised. I will try later this week to state (briefly) what I have concluded from our previous discussions. On this point, Buchanan's continued use of the phrase "blanket consent" irks me -- we have never

seriously considered this, and it is a false dichotomy. But more on this later. My state -- which has the worse economy in the nation -- is currently about to go into overtime for the legislative session -- and my budget is one of the key issues caught in the middle between the house and senate. I hope this gets resolved by this Thursday.
larry

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> ("Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-JUL-1998 16:55:04.00

SUBJECT: FW: Improvements in Cloning Technique

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
FYI

Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
Executive Director
National Bioethics Advisory Commission
6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
Tel: (301) 402-4242
Fax: (301) 480-6900
Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
http://www.bioethics.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Hull, Randolph Everson (OD)
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 1998 4:30 PM
To: Andrew Siegel; Deborah McCurry; Elisa Eiseman; Emma Codrington; Eric
Meslin; Evadne Hammett; Feinstein, Emily; Freeman, Bill; Hull, Randolph Everson;
Hyatt-Knorr, Henrietta; LaShell Gaskins; lpknowle@facstaff.wisc.edu; Melissa
Goldstein; Norris, Patricia; Quinlan, Margaret; Simon, Sean; Tanner, Rob; Temp
NBAC
Subject: Improvements in Cloning Technique

Hawaii Scientists Clone 50 Mice

By Joseph B. Verrengia
AP Science Writer
Wednesday, July 22, 1998; 3:40 p.m. EDT

In what could be a big boost for all sorts of biomedical research, scientists in
Hawaii have turned out more than 50 carbon-copy mice using what is believed to
be a more reliable cloning technique than the one used to create Dolly the

sheep.

The scientific potential could be broad because mice are the best-understood and most commonly used animals in biomedical experiments. Having genetically identical copies of the same animal could speed research in fundamental biology and virtually every branch of medicine and drug development.

The University of Hawaii scientists, reporting in Thursday's issue of the journal Nature, describe their work as "the first reproducible cloning of a mammal from adult cells" extending at least three generations.

They said it is a marked improvement over the method used to make Dolly, which other laboratories so far have failed to duplicate.

Biologists in the United States and Europe hailed the mice-cloning effort as having much greater potential than the cloning of more complex creatures such as Dolly or a pair of calves that were born earlier this month in Japan.

"The importance of this report cannot be overemphasized," said Davor Solter, a biologist at the Max Plank Institute in Germany.

Researchers said that with the Hawaii cloning method, cattle and pigs could be reprogrammed with human genes to mass-produce proteins essential to treat illnesses such as diabetes and Parkinson's disease. Animals could custom-grow organs for transplantation.

And because mice give birth three times a year, experiments employing identical rodents could progress more rapidly than those relying on slower-reproducing barnyard animals.

"Genetics will become much more accessible to us," said Virginia Papaioannou of Columbia University.

The Hawaii scientists would not discuss whether their technique might make human cloning more feasible.

Researchers introduced four of the cloned mice -- all females -- Wednesday in New York. The original clone was named Cumulina after the type of cell used in its creation; she remained in Hawaii.

Working in a windowless lab for 16 hours a day, the Hawaii group used an injection method dubbed the "Honolulu technique" to transfer genetic material from adult mice to an empty egg. In each of four experiments beginning in 1997, the team transferred up to 800 eggs containing adult genes into surrogate mice mothers.

Three survivors from the original group, including Cumulina, grew to adulthood. Those clones eventually yielded cells that by this week had generated more than 50 offspring.

DNA testing by an independent laboratory confirmed that none of the rodents are carrying stray DNA from other mice.

"We succeeded in using both a new method and a new type of cell to clone mice from adult cells, and in repeating it to produce clones of clones of clones," said Teruhiko Wakayama, lead author of the Hawaii study.

The Hawaii group's emphasis on repeating the clones is an indirect rebuke of geneticist Ian Wilmut and his colleagues in Scotland who created Dolly in one out of 277 attempts in the lab.

Repeating an experiment to verify a discovery is central to scientific research. But at least three other laboratories have failed to duplicate the sheep experiment using Wilmut's method over the past 18 months, prompting scientists to question whether Dolly is truly a clone.

In Thursday's issue of Nature, Wilmut and 17 other researchers in Britain reported that an exhaustive examination of Dolly's genes show that it is "extraordinarily unlikely" that the sheep is anything but a clone.

Dolly was created by a technique known as electrofusion, in which the membrane of an egg was breached, the chromosomes were removed and the nucleus of an adult sheep cell with different genetic material was merged inside.

In the Honolulu technique, the nucleus of a cell from one mouse was injected through a tiny needle into an egg donated by a second mouse. The egg's original genetic package was removed. The donor nucleus came from cumulus cells,

which
surround the developing eggs in the ovaries of female mice.

Up to 3 percent of the manipulated eggs developed into surviving clones, a much
higher success rate than the electrofusion method had.

Back to the top

Cloning Report | National Section | Home Page

<Picture>

<Picture><Picture: WashingtonPost.com>
<Picture: Navigation image map><Picture><Picture>

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Dr. Lawrence H. Miike" <lhmiike@mail.health.state.hi.us> ("Dr. Lawrence H. Miike" <lhmiike@mail.health.state.hi.us> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-JUL-1998 15:09:42.00

SUBJECT: mice, mice, and more mice!

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
I have the privilege tomorrow of representing the governor at a ceremony at the university of hawaii, honoring Ryuzo Yanagimachi's mice cloning successes. it's of note to me that his accomplishments have taken a shorter time than our two ongoing (and ongoing, and ongoing) planned reports.
larry

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: kramer <bkramers@worldnet.att.net> (kramer <bkramers@worldnet.att.net> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-JUL-1998 15:24:11.00

SUBJECT: Re: mice, mice, and more mice!

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Dr. Lawrence H. Miike wrote:
>
> I have the privilege tomorrow of representing the governor at a ceremony
> at the university of hawaii, honoring Ryuzo Yanagimachi's mice cloning
> successes. it's of note to me that his accomplishments have taken a
> shorter time than our two ongoing (and ongoing, and ongoing) planned
> reports.
> larry
Larry I'm curious why in the NY Times story (the original story) it was
rreported that Science turned down the story without peer review because
it was deemed "not of general interest". Any clues why that would have
been so. And thanks for the pineapple. We really enjoyed it and the
dried pieces too. They were delicious. Are they a different species?
They tasted very apple. How was the crabmeat? I hope it got there OK.
Bette

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> ("Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-AUG-1998 17:21:56.00

SUBJECT: A letter to the President

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Dear Commissioners et al:

Harold has asked me to let you know that he has sent a letter to the President
offering to provide him a brief update on the cloning issue. A copy of the
letter is being faxed to you.

Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
Executive Director
National Bioethics Advisory Commission
6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
Tel: (301) 402-4242
Fax: (301) 480-6900
Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
http://www.bioethics.gov

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: David Y. Stevens (CN=David Y. Stevens/OU=OSTP/O=EOP [OSTP])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-AUG-1998 16:55:07.00

SUBJECT: help

TO: Mark A. Kitchens (CN=Mark A. Kitchens/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Hey Mark--
Thanks a million for making the change to the clips for Dr. Lane. He was impressed.

I have another request.... This morning on NPR (Morning Edition) they had a piece on cloning mice. Could you send me the transcript that I seem to remember you having access to. If you don't, please let me know if you have any suggestions.

Thank you very much.

David

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> ("Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-DEC-1998 10:06:52.00

SUBJECT: RE: stem cell hearings

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Just to add a bit to Alta's email--

I had a chance after the hearing to speak with Sen. Harkin. His interest is not limited to the relatively narrow issue of patenting organisms (gene. est's, etc.), but to broader issues of intellectual property, industry/academic collaborations, and freedom of scientific inquiry. I informed him, briefly, that NBAC will likely address "some" of these issues (I didn't specify which) in our stem cell report. I also informed him that our executive Order does include gene patenting as a subject. He mentioned an interest in holding a separate hearing on the subject, and Sen. Specter seemed to agree that this was necessary. Given this interest, I agree that we need to be up to speed, and we will be. Kathi and I have already discussed a plan to brief Specter and Harkin's staff on NBAC's work.

For the information of commissioners, Kathi is developing an outline for the project, with proposed wittiness, timelines, and after further discussion, we'll send it around to commissioners for their information. We intend to devote much of our January meeting to the stem cell project.

Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
Executive Director
National Bioethics Advisory Commission
6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
Tel: (301) 402-4242
Fax: (301) 480-6900
Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
http://www.bioethics.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: r. alta charo [SMTP:racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu]
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 1998 1:00 AM
To: NBAC Members E-list
Subject: stem cell hearings

as you know, the senate appropriations subcommittee that has jurisdiction over the nih budget had hearings today on stem cells. senators arlen spector (r) and tom harkin (d) held the hearing. i'm taping it off c-span and would happy to mail the tape around to anyone who cares to see it. it included the hopkins and univ of wisconsin researchers, michael west of advanced cell technology -- talking about the researrch and possible applications -- harold varmus talking about nih's possible interests in this area, and art caplan, richard doerflinger from the national council of catholic bishops, and thomas okarma of geron (which financed the univ of wisconsin research) on the ethics. also appearing was eric meslin, who appeared on about 12 hours notice on behalf of the commission, and who did a lovely job explaining what we've done and what we are about to do.

one thing i noted was senator harkin's significant interest in the separable issues surrounding the patenting of stem cells,. He seemed to imply an interest in whether patenting of stem cells will slow the dissemination of their use in the development of medical applications. one of the very last exchanges involved okarma from geron arguing that patents and licenses are consistent with widespread academic and industrial use of the cells and development of therapies. currently there is a lively empirical debate about the economic and technology transfer effects of current patent policy on patenting of gene sequences and engineered organisms, and i wonder if we might need to come up to speed on that debate, as least by way of background to whatever else we do for our

report
on stem cell research.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Alex Capron <acapron@law.usc.edu> (Alex Capron <acapron@law.usc.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-JAN-1999 14:10:05.00

SUBJECT: Re: Messages from Larry and Arturo

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
On Sat, 30 Jan 1999, Kathi E. Hanna wrote:

> Thank you Alex for moving us along. I would add four things that I hope
the
> Commission will discuss next week. They are assumptions that many make
but
> that I feel we need to test.
>
KATHY--THANKS FOR THESE USEFUL COMMENTS. MY COMMENTS ARE IN CAPS, JUST TO SET THEM OFF (NOT YELLING!).

> 1. I have begun talking to some IVF providers. In their experience, very
few
> couples donate embryos they no longer need to research. Most donate to
> another infertile couple or choose to discard (in that order). Possibly
> fewer than 10 percent donate to research. So, in the view of at least 2
> providers, the 10s of thousands of cryopreserved embryos currently in
> storage are NOT available for research. That does not mean, however, that
> those that would be available are insufficient. By the way, couples are
not
> asked about donation to research until a decision has to be made about
> future storage, with one exception, some centers ask couples whether they
> want to designate what should be done with stored embryos in the event of
> their death, or if there is a termination of the marriage.

IS THIS THE SORT OF THING ABOUT WHICH SOME ORGANIZATION (LIKE FERTILITY SOCIETY) COULD PROVIDE DATA? EVEN 10% OF A LARGE # MIGHT BE SIGNIFICANT. BUT IF THE NUMBER DOESN'T SEEM LARGE, GIVEN RESEARCH INTEREST, OUR REPORT COULD MAKE THIS CLEAR...AS WELL AS POINTING OUT POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND ETHICAL WEIGHT OF SUCH.

> 2. When IVF centers "form" embryos for research, they nearly always use
> donated gametes from sources who do not know each other. The sources have
> given consent to this type of research.
>

AGAIN, USEFUL TO KNOW THE PROTOCOLS & CONSENT DOCUMENTS USED & WHETHER STANDARDIZED.

> 3. There is some question about the research "value" of cryopreserved
> embryos, in terms of decomposition (when stored for long periods of
time).
>
BUT AREN'T THEY USED FOR THE EVEN MORE DAUNTING TASK OF CREATING PREGNANCIES, WITH SOME SUCCESS?

> 4. The DHHS ruling does not speak to whether stem cells derived from
embryos
> created through somatic cell nuclear transfer also may be used in
research.
> We might assume that they can be, based on the Statement of
Administration
> Policy that was distributed to you at the last meeting. However, because
the
> ruling appears to be silent on this, we are seeking clarification from
the
> DHHS Counsel.
>

I WILL BE INTERESTED IN HEARING RABB'S RESPONSE. I READ HER OPINION LETTER DIFFERENTLY: SHE ADDRESSED CLONING AND MADE CLEAR THAT FEDERAL FUNDS MAY NOT BE USED FOR RESEARCH IN WHICH STEM CELLS ARE USED TO CREATE CLONES (I.E. BECOME THE SOURCE OF THE NUCLEAR DNA TRANSFERED TO AN EMBRYO). IT SEEMED TO ME THAT THE WORDING OF THAT SECTION OF THE MEMO WAS MEANT _BY ITS VERY SILENCE_ TO SAY "NO PROBLEM WITH RESEARCH USING STEM CELLS CREATED BY CLONING IN ANY RESEARCH THAT WOULD OK WITH STEM CELLS CREATED BY OTHER METHODS." OBVIOUSLY, I MAY HAVE OVERREAD THE MEMO, BUT GIVEN THE CONTEXT (I.E. THAT HER CLIENT, VARMUS, CLEARLY RAISED THE CREATION OF STEM CELLS BY THREE METHODS AND SHE ADDRESSED THE PROBLEMS AND/OR RESTRICTIONS ATTACHING TO THE OTHER TWO METHODS IN DETAIL) I TOOK THIS SILENCE TO BE A CLEAR ALBEIT UNSPOKEN MESSAGE.

> See most of you Tuesday.
>
> Kathi

AGAIN, THANKS FOR THE INFO AND HOPE MORE CAN BE GOTTEN IN SHORT ORDER WITHOUT TOO MUCH ADDED WORK. SEE YOU NEXT WEEK.

Alex

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Alexander Capron <acapron@law.usc.edu> (Alexander Capron <acapron@law.usc.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-MAR-1999 18:03:58.00

SUBJECT: Cloning

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
There is an interesting statement on human cloning & stem cells from the Australian Academy of Science in which they argue that the Australian Health Ethics Committee, while right to oppose reproductive cloning, is wrong to recommend against the creation of ES cells through cloning. Instead, the Council of the AAS urges a two step process in which public scrutiny would be maintained by having review of research both by institutional ethics committees (their IRBs) and "a national panel of experts, established by the National Health and Medical Research Council, on the scientific merits, safety issues and ethical acceptability of the work."

Sounds familiar.....
Alex

Alexander Morgan Capron acapron@law.usc.edu

University Professor of Law and Medicine (213) 740-2557 (voice)
Co-Director, Pacific Center for (213) 740-5502 (fax)
Health Policy and Ethics (213) 740-2541 (Pacific Ctr.)
University of Southern California (213) 740-2548 (secretary)
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0071 (213) 740-0149 (Pac. Ctr. fax)

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "r. alta charo" <racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu> ("r. alta charo" <racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-APR-1999 22:06:39.00

SUBJECT: comprehensive memo

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
here is a proposal for a revised version of the letter/memo on human subjects:

The President
The White House
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Mr. President:

Consistent with your October 3, 1995, Executive Order 12975, the National Bioethics Advisory Commission has focused for the last three years on issues surrounding the protection of human research subjects. To supplement the reports we have already submitted. I take this opportunity to provide you with a summary of our concerns and preliminary findings, some of which will, in our judgment, require further actions by the Federal Government. The attached memo provides additional details, but our key concerns are the following:

Federal protections for persons serving as human research subjects do not yet extend to all Americans.

Despite widespread implementation by those agencies sponsoring substantial amounts of biomedical research, a number of agencies and departments who sponsor primarily non-biomedical research or little research overall have failed to implement these federal protections.

Federal protections do not always include special provisions for especially vulnerable populations of research subjects.

Many federal agencies find implementation confusing or burdensome. Federal protections are difficult to enforce and improve effectively, because there is no single authority that governs research protections.

New enforcement techniques are needed to ensure implementation at the local level.

We will submit a more comprehensive report to you in the coming months, which will provide specific recommendations for reform. Of course, as with all Commission studies, we will ensure that the public, the research community, and the agencies of the Federal Government have an opportunity participate in the report's preparation.

Sincerely,

Harold T. Shapiro
Chair

NBAC Summary of Preliminary Findings:
Adequacy of Federal Protections for Human Subjects in Research

Extending federal protections for human research subjects to all Americans.

In 1978, the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects in Biomedical and Behavioral Research called for basic protections for all research subjects. Two other national bioethics commission endorsed this idea in the 1980s. And in 1997, President Clinton stated that "science must respect the dignity of every American. We must never allow our citizens to be unwitting guinea pigs in scientific experiments...." That same month, the National Bioethics Advisory Commission (NBAC) resolved, as a matter of ethical principle, that no person ought to be enrolled in research without the twin protections of informed consent and independent review of the research. The National Bioethics Advisory Commission notes with concern that this goal remains unmet.

In particular, the protections of the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, also known as the Common Rule, do not extend to all Americans;

the Common Rule applies only to subjects in research regulated by the Food and Drug Administration or to research sponsored by some federal departments and agencies . (insert endnote here listing the federal departments and agencies that are signatories). Among the Common Rule's most important protections are the requirements for independent review of the research by a local "Institutional Review Board" ("IRB") and for informed consent by research subjects. Despite the fact that many research institutions voluntarily apply the Common Rule, even to their privately financed research, there are other significant sectors of privately funded research that remain ungoverned either by State or Federal law.

The Commission finds that the absence of Federal jurisdiction over much privately funded research means that the U.S. government cannot know how many Americans are currently subjects in experiments, cannot influence how they have been recruited, cannot ensure that research subjects know and understand the risks they are undertaking, and cannot ascertain whether they have been harmed.

Not only does this prevent the Federal Government from protecting Americans enrolling in research, but it affects the Federal Government's ability to craft policies governing emerging technologies. While preparing its 1997 report "Cloning Human Beings," for example, the Commission noted that the Common Rule's lack of jurisdiction over privately funded research made it impossible to rely on IRBs as the primary mechanism for protecting human subjects against inappropriate applications of that technology.

Implementation of the Common Rule

Beginning in 1996, federal departments and agencies responded to the Commission's request for information pursuant to Executive Order 12975. NBAC is pleased to report that agencies have responded to the Executive Order not only by reporting on their current protections, but by evaluating those protections and taking steps to strengthen them. Based on the agency reports and actions, and on its own investigations and contracted studies, the Commission concludes

that the Common Rule has significantly reduced, but not eliminated, the possibility for harm to human subjects. As a result, NBAC also concludes that
there is a need for significant improvement, both to enforce Federal protections and to make their implementation less burdensome for federal agencies and researchers.

Research regulated by the FDA, or sponsored by one of the federal departments
or independent agencies that have adopted the Common Rule, requires prior approval and continuing oversight by an IRB. NBAC has found that all the Federal departments and agencies who sponsor substantial amounts of biomedical
research with human subjects have implemented these requirements. On the other
hand, several departments and agencies that sponsor behavioral and other non-biomedical research have not fully implemented the provisions of the Common
Rule, despite the fact that such research may pose serious non-physical risks,
such as loss of insurance or employment, discrimination, incarceration, and invasion of privacy. In addition, the Commission notes that the Common Rule does not require any special protections for especially vulnerable populations,
such as children. The Commission has identified occasions of non-biomedical
research on these populations that posed more than minimal risk but that was
conducted by one of the many agencies that has not adopted special protections
that go beyond those required by the Common Rule.

Federal departments and agencies do face obstacles in the way of full implementation of the Common Rule. The Commission notes that many agencies
find the Common Rule confusing or its provisions too burdensome in light of the
type or amount of research they sponsor. While some agencies have been taking
steps to bring themselves into compliance with the Common Rule, nearly all of
them agree that increased protection of human subjects cannot be achieved without additional staffing and highly visible statements of commitment from
the leadership of their respective departments. Some have also suggested that
a central authority governing human subjects research could help to interpret
the Common Rule's requirements, create the oversight structures needed for its
implementation, and advise on ethically complex protocols.
The Commission also finds that centralized leadership is needed to achieve

consistent interpretation of key statutory and regulatory requirements. Lack of a single authority also means that improvement in human subjects protections, such as those specific to vulnerable populations, requires that every affected department independently adopt new regulations, which is inevitably slower and more inefficient than adoption by a central authority.

By way of example, in its 1998 report AResearch Involving Persons With Mental Disorders That May Affect Decisionmaking Capacity,@ the Commission observed that some affected agencies were hard-pressed to reconcile their agency mission of fostering badly needed research into the causes and cures for mental illness with the shared Federal commitment to paying scrupulous attention to the interests of vulnerable human subjects. In addition, the absence of a single, authoritative Federal office to oversee human subjects protections will make it difficult to ensure that all affected departments will issue regulations implementing NBAC=s recommendations; indeed, similar recommendations were made twenty years ago by another national bioethics commission regarding the same population, but were never adopted.

Ensuring Adequate and Accountable Local Oversight

In addition to extending the protections of the Common Rule to all Americans and strengthening federal protections, NBAC notes that the shortcomings of the federal regulatory system only exacerbate problems within the human subjects protections system nationwide. The decentralized local system is sorely strained by inadequate staffing and education of IRBs; by the explosion in research activity; by emerging ethical issues arising from ethical issues raised by epidemiological and public health research; by the trend toward collaborative, multi-centered research, and by an absence of comprehensive public accountability.

The Commission's work illustrates many of these problems, and offers some solutions. Its upcoming report on research involving human biological materials, for example, suggests some solutions to the difficult problem of applying current federal protections to epidemiological research on stored tissue and medical records, while its project on international research norms is revealing the dilemmas posed by collaborative research across national boundaries. Its1998 report "Research Involving Persons With Mental Disorders

That May Affect Decisionmaking Capacity," emphasized the need to maintain the
public's trust in the integrity of the scientific endeavor. To that end, the
Commission suggested that "IRBs can effectively use the mechanisms of audit
(both internal and external) and disclosure to improve accountability and
inspire public confidence in their oversight activities."

Conclusion

The Commission finds that the current federal regulations have served well to
prevent most recurrences of the gross abuses associated with biomedical
research in the earlier part of this century. Nonetheless, some abuses still
occur, and the system is in need of significant revision in order to provide
clear, efficient, and authoritative guidance to federal departments and
agencies, and to ensure that local oversight is effective and accountable to
the public. This is essential to improving protections for human research
subjects It is also a necessary first step toward extending these protections
to those Americans not yet protected by any State or Federal standards for
human subjects in research.

---

r. alta charo, j.d.
professor of law & medical ethics

electronic addresses:
racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu
http://www.law.wisc.edu/faculty/charoalt.htm

telephonic addresses:
608-262-5015 (tel)
608-262-5485 (fax)

postal address:
university of wisconsin law school
7111 law building
975 bascom mall
madison, wisconsin 53706 usa

- att1.htm========== ATTACHMENT 1 ==========
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
<html> here is a proposal for a revised version of the letter/memo on

human subjects:

The President
The White House
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Mr. President:

Consistent with your October 3, 1995, Executive Order 12975, the National Bioethics Advisory Commission has focused for the last three years on issues surrounding the protection of human research subjects. To supplement the reports we have already submitted. I take this opportunity to provide you with a summary of our concerns and preliminary findings, some of which will, in our judgment, require further actions by the Federal Government. The attached memo provides additional details, but our key concerns are the following:

Federal protections for persons serving as human research subjects do not yet extend to all Americans.

Despite widespread implementation by those agencies sponsoring substantial amounts of biomedical research, a number of agencies and departments who sponsor primarily non-biomedical research or little research overall have failed to implement these federal protections.

Federal protections do not always include special provisions for especially vulnerable populations of research subjects.

Many federal agencies find implementation confusing or burdensome.
Federal protections are difficult to enforce and improve effectively, because there is no single authority that governs research protections.

New enforcement techniques are needed to ensure implementation at the local level.

We will submit a more comprehensive report to you in the coming months, which will provide specific recommendations for reform. Of course, as with all Commission studies, we will ensure that the public, the research community, and the agencies of the Federal Government have an opportunity participate in the report's preparation.

Sincerely,

Harold T. Shapiro
Chair

NBAC Summary of Preliminary Findings:
Adequacy of Federal Protections for Human Subjects in Research

Extending federal protections for human research subjects to all Americans.

In 1978, the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects in Biomedical and Behavioral Research called for basic protections for all research subjects. Two other national bioethics commission endorsed this idea in the 1980s. And in 1997, President Clinton stated that "science must respect the dignity of every American. We must never allow our citizens to be unwitting guinea pigs in scientific experiments...." That same month, the National Bioethics Advisory Commission (NBAC) resolved, as a matter of ethical principle, that no person ought to be enrolled in research without the twin protections of informed consent and independent review of the research. The National Bioethics Advisory Commission notes with concern that this goal remains unmet.

In particular, the protections of the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, also known as the Common Rule, do not extend to all Americans; the Common Rule applies only to subjects in research regulated by the Food and Drug Administration or to research sponsored by some federal departments and agencies . (insert endnote here listing the federal departments and agencies that are signatories). Among the Common Rule's most important protections are the requirements for independent review of the research by a local "Institutional Review Board" ("IRB") and for informed consent by research subjects. Despite the fact that many research institutions voluntarily apply the Common Rule, even to their privately financed research, there are other significant sectors of privately funded research that remain ungoverned either by State or Federal law.

The Commission finds that the absence of Federal jurisdiction over much privately funded research means that the U.S. government cannot know how many Americans are currently subjects in experiments, cannot influence how they have been recruited, cannot ensure that research subjects know and understand the risks they are undertaking, and cannot ascertain whether they have been harmed.

Not only does this prevent the Federal Government from protecting Americans enrolling in research, but it affects the Federal Government's

ability to craft policies governing emerging technologies. While preparing its 1997 report "Cloning Human Beings," for example, the Commission noted that the Common Rule's lack of jurisdiction over privately funded research made it impossible to rely on IRBs as the primary mechanism for protecting human subjects against inappropriate applications of that technology.

Implementation of the Common Rule

Beginning in 1996, federal departments and agencies responded to the Commission's request for information pursuant to Executive Order 12975. NBAC is pleased to report that agencies have responded to the Executive Order not only by reporting on their current protections, but by evaluating those protections and taking steps to strengthen them. Based on the agency reports and actions, and on its own investigations and contracted studies, the Commission concludes that the Common Rule has significantly reduced, but not eliminated, the possibility for harm to human subjects. As a result, NBAC also concludes that there is a need for significant improvement, both to enforce Federal protections and to make their implementation less burdensome for federal agencies and researchers.

Research regulated by the FDA, or sponsored by one of the federal departments or independent agencies that have adopted the Common Rule, requires prior approval and continuing oversight by an IRB. NBAC has found that all the Federal departments and agencies who sponsor substantial amounts of biomedical research with human subjects have implemented these requirements. On the other hand, several departments and agencies that sponsor behavioral and other non-biomedical research have not fully implemented the provisions of the Common Rule, despite the fact that such research may pose serious non-physical risks, such as loss of insurance or employment, discrimination, incarceration, and invasion of privacy. In addition, the Commission notes that the Common Rule does not require any special protections for especially vulnerable populations, such as children. The Commission has identified occasions of non-biomedical research on these populations that posed more than minimal risk but that was conducted by one of the many agencies that has not adopted special protections that go beyond those required by the Common Rule.

Federal departments and agencies do face obstacles in the way of full implementation of the Common Rule. The Commission notes that many agencies find the Common Rule confusing or its provisions too burdensome in light of the type or amount of research they sponsor. While some agencies have been taking steps to bring themselves into compliance with the Common Rule, nearly all of them agree that increased protection of human subjects cannot be achieved without additional staffing and highly visible statements of commitment from the leadership of their respective departments. Some have also suggested that a

central authority governing human subjects research could help to interpret the Common Rule's requirements, create the oversight structures needed for its implementation, and advise on ethically complex protocols.
The Commission also finds that centralized leadership is needed to achieve consistent interpretation of key statutory and regulatory requirements. Lack of a single authority also means that improvement in human subjects protections, such as those specific to vulnerable populations, requires that every affected department independently adopt new regulations, which is inevitably slower and more inefficient than adoption by a central authority.

By way of example, in its 1998 report AResearch Involving Persons With Mental Disorders That May Affect Decisionmaking Capacity,@ the Commission observed that some affected agencies were hard-pressed to reconcile their agency mission of fostering badly needed research into the causes and cures for mental illness with the shared Federal commitment to paying scrupulous attention to the interests of vulnerable human subjects. In addition, the absence of a single, authoritative Federal office to oversee human subjects protections will make it difficult to ensure that all affected departments will issue regulations implementing NBAC=s recommendations; indeed, similar recommendations were made twenty years ago by another national bioethics commission regarding the same population, but were never adopted.

Ensuring Adequate and Accountable Local Oversight

In addition to extending the protections of the Common Rule to all Americans and strengthening federal protections, NBAC notes that the shortcomings of the federal regulatory system only exacerbate problems within the human subjects protections system nationwide. The decentralized local system is sorely strained by inadequate staffing and education of IRBs; by the explosion in research activity; by emerging ethical issues arising from ethical issues raised by epidemiological and public health research; by the trend toward collaborative, multi-centered research, and by an absence of comprehensive public accountability.

The Commission's work illustrates many of these problems, and offers some solutions. Its upcoming report on research involving human biological materials, for example, suggests some solutions to the difficult problem of applying current federal protections to epidemiological research on stored tissue and medical records, while its project on international research norms is revealing the dilemmas posed by collaborative research across national boundaries. Its1998 report "Research Involving Persons With Mental Disorders That May Affect Decisionmaking Capacity," emphasized the need to maintain the public's trust in the integrity of the scientific endeavor. To that end, the Commission suggested that "IRBs can effectively use the mechanisms of audit (both internal and external) and disclosure to improve accountability and inspire public confidence in their oversight activities."

Conclusion

The Commission finds that the current federal regulations have
served well to prevent most recurrences of the gross abuses associated
with biomedical research in the earlier part of this century.
Nonetheless, some abuses still occur, and the system is in need of
significant revision in order to provide clear, efficient, and
authoritative guidance to federal departments and agencies, and to ensure
that local oversight is effective and accountable to the public.
This is essential to improving protections for human research
subjects It is also a necessary first step toward extending these
protections to those Americans not yet protected by any State or Federal
standards for human subjects in research.

---

r. alta charo, j.d.
professor of law & medical ethics

electronic addresses:
racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu
http://
www.law.wisc.edu/faculty/charoalt.htm

telephonic addresses:
608-262-5015 (tel)
608-262-5485 (fax)

postal address:
university of wisconsin law school
7111 law building
975 bascom mall
madison, wisconsin 53706 usa<x-tab> </x-tab>

</html>

========== END ATTACHMENT 1 ==========

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "r. alta charo" <racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu> ("r. alta charo" <racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:18-MAY-1999 18:56:39.00

SUBJECT: fyi

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
2) Cloning...with a Twist
You remember Dolly, the cloned sheep, now meet Millie, a goat that goes one-step farther. Researchers at the Louisiana State University (LSU) Agricultural Center and Genzyme Transgenic Corporation announced that they have produced the world's first cloned transgenic goats.
Not only were they able to clone Millie using the cells of a 30-day old goat fetus, but they were also able to create a goat whose milk contains a therapeutic protein that could be extracted to make a drug for patients undergoing coronary bypass surgery.
"The technology used to clone the three Genzyme goats is one of the first applications of the nuclear transfer (cloning) procedure to produce transgenic goats for the pharmaceutical industry," said Richard Denniston, a researcher with the LSU Agricultural Center.
The protein produced by Millie is called anti-thrombin III and is currently in human trials.
For the complete story visit:
http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/1999/05/990512075340.htm
---

---

r. alta charo, j.d.
professor of law & medical ethics

electronic addresses:
racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu
http://www.law.wisc.edu/faculty/charoalt.htm

telephonic addresses:
608-262-5015 (tel)
608-262-5485 (fax)

postal address:
university of wisconsin law school
7111 law building
975 bascom mall
madison, wisconsin 53706 usa

- att1.htm========== ATTACHMENT 1 ==========

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
<html>
2) Cloning...with a Twist
You remember Dolly, the cloned sheep, now meet Millie, a goat that
goes one-step farther. Researchers at the Louisiana State University

(LSU) Agricultural Center and Genzyme Transgenic Corporation announced

that they have produced the world's first cloned transgenic goats.
Not only were they able to clone Millie using the cells of a 30-day

old goat fetus, but they were also able to create a goat whose milk

contains a therapeutic protein that could be extracted to make a drug

for patients undergoing coronary bypass surgery.
"The technology used to clone the three Genzyme goats is one of the

first applications of the nuclear transfer (cloning) procedure to
produce transgenic goats for the pharmaceutical industry," said
Richard
Denniston, a researcher with the LSU Agricultural Center.
The protein produced by Millie is called anti-thrombin III and is
currently in human trials.
For the complete story visit:
<u><a href="http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/1999/05/
990512075340.htm" eudora="autourl">http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/1999/05
/990512075340.htm</u>

----
r. alta charo, j.d.
professor of law & medical ethics

electronic addresses:
racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu
http://
www.law.wisc.edu/faculty/charoalt.htm

telephonic addresses:
608-262-5015 (tel)
608-262-5485 (fax)

postal address:
university of wisconsin law school
7111 law building
975 bascom mall
madison, wisconsin 53706 usa<x-tab> </x-tab>

</html>

========== END ATTACHMENT 1 ==========

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "r. alta charo" <racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu> ("r. alta charo" <racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-JUN-1999 15:00:40.00

SUBJECT: more on cloning

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
here is the press release from nature genetics; now i am REALLY confused. are
they considering the mammary gland cells taken from dolly to be cells from the
"female reproductive system"? that's a broader use of the term "reproductive
system" than i (as a lay person) would have expected.

Press Release for Nature Genetics:
June 1999

EMBARGO: 17:00 EST, Monday 31st May 1999

Please mention Nature Genetics as the source of these items

Affirmative action in cloning
Page 127;

Sheep, mice, cows and goats have now been successfully cloned by transferring nuclei from different types of cells into separate cells, and the techniques of cloning are becoming more widely available for a variety of biotechnological applications. But despite its successes, the technology is still inefficient, because many of the factors that affect cloning are not well understood. For example, it is unclear why only the nuclei from certain adult cell types, typically those from the female reproductive system, have produced viable clones. The result? Only female animals have been reported in the scientific literature.

Until now, that is. Teruhiko Wakayama and Ryuzo Yanagimachi (of the University of Hawaii) - who cloned the first mouse (a female, Cumulina) from female 'cumulus' cells in 1997 - now report the cloning of the first male mouse. The authors explored the efficacy of cloning mice using different cell types, including some from the tails of male mice, from which the first male, nicknamed "Fibro" (short for "fibroblast", the type of cell from which he probably was derived) was cloned. He is completely

normal in all respects, including body weight, growth and fertility. These findings show that cloning of mammals from adult cells is not restricted to those from females, and males' (and females') tails may serve as a ready source of DNA for future mouse cloning experiments.

---

r. alta charo, j.d.
professor of law & medical ethics

electronic addresses:
racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu
http://www.law.wisc.edu/faculty/charoalt.htm

telephonic addresses:
608-262-5015 (tel)
608-262-5485 (fax)

postal address:
university of wisconsin law school
7111 law building
975 bascom mall
madison, wisconsin 53706 usa

- att1.htm========== ATTACHMENT 1 ==========
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
<html> here is the press release from nature genetics; now i am REALLY confused. are they considering the mammary gland cells taken from dolly to be cells from the "female reproductive system"? that's a broader use of the term "reproductive system" than i (as a lay person) would have expected.

Press Release for Nature Genetics:
June 1999

EMBARGO: 17:00 EST, Monday 31st May 1999

Please mention Nature Genetics as the source of these items

Affirmative action in cloning
Page 127;

Sheep, mice, cows and goats have now been successfully cloned
by transferring nuclei from different types of cells into separate
cells, and the techniques of cloning are becoming more

widely
available for a variety of biotechnological applications.
But
despite its successes, the technology is still inefficient,
because
many of the factors that affect cloning are not well understood.
For
example, it is unclear why only the nuclei from certain adult
cell
types, typically those from the female reproductive system,
have
produced viable clones. The result? Only female animals have
been reported in the scientific literature.

Until now, that is. Teruhiko Wakayama and Ryuzo Yanagimachi
(of the University of Hawaii) - who cloned the first mouse
(a
female, Cumulina) from female 'cumulus' cells in 1997 - now
report the cloning of the first male mouse. The authors
explored
the efficacy of cloning mice using different cell types,
including
some from the tails of male mice, from which the first male,
nicknamed "Fibro" (short for "fibroblast", the
type of cell from
which he probably was derived) was cloned. He is completely
normal in all respects, including body weight, growth and
fertility.
These findings show that cloning of mammals from adult cells
is
not restricted to those from females, and males' (and
females')
tails may serve as a ready source of DNA for future mouse
cloning experiments.

---

r. alta charo, j.d.
professor of law & medical ethics

electronic addresses:
racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu
http://
www.law.wisc.edu/faculty/charoalt.htm

telephonic addresses:
608-262-5015 (tel)
608-262-5485 (fax)

postal address:
university of wisconsin law school
7111 law building
975 bascom mall
madison, wisconsin 53706 usa<x-tab> </x-tab>

</html>

========== END ATTACHMENT 1 ==========

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: David Cox <cox@paxil.stanford.edu> (David Cox <cox@paxil.stanford.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-JUN-1999 19:04:13.00

SUBJECT: Re: fyi on cloning, with a query

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
So here is what is new- that the somatic cell used for the somatic cell nuclear transfer was from the TAIL of an adult mouse, instead of a specialized cell type that surrounds the oocyte (ie. follicle cells). All prior work using mice for somatic cell nuclear transfer had used these somewhat specialized follicular somatic cells rather than a run of the mill adult tail cell. I hope this helps clarify the science.

David

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Carol Greider <cgreider@jhmi.edu> (Carol Greider <cgreider@jhmi.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-JUN-1999 15:00:33.00

SUBJECT: Re: fyi on cloning, with a query

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Alta,

there were a number of wrong things said in that article that you posted.
Here is the Nature genetic Text. i'll try to read it carefully and answer
your specific questions once I get back from a quantilying committee
meeting this afternoon. Meanwhile at least you ahve the orignal text.

Carol

volume 22 no. 2 pp 127 - 128

Cloning of male mice from adult tail-tip cells

Teruhiko Wakayama & Ryuzo Yanagimachi

Department of Anatomy and Reproductive Biology, University of Hawaii School of Medicine, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822, USA.
Correspondence should be addressed to . e-mail: yana@hawaii.edu

Cloning entire animals from adult somatic cells has recently been accomplished in sheep1, mouse2 and cow3, 4. Thus far, all reported clones derived from adult animals have been produced using cells related to the female reproductive system (for example mammary gland cells1, ovarian cumulus/granulosa cells2, 4 and oviductal cells3), raising the question of whether males can be cloned in this way. We have previously reported the production of viable cloned female mice by nuclear transfer of cumulus cells2. Now, we have applied our technique to, and report success in, cloning using male-derived cells.

B6D2F1 female mice (with black coat colour; 8-10 weeks old) were induced to superovulate. Metaphase II chromosomes were removed from oocytes as

described2 and donor cells were isolated from the tail-tips of adult B6C3F1 male mice (agouti coat colour; 10-12 weeks). Tail-tips were freed from skin, cut into small pieces and incubated in Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium (DMEM; 5 ml) supplemented with 10% fetal calf serum (FCS). After culture for 5-7 days at 37.5 øC under 5% CO2 in air, many cells were observed to be spread over the surface of the dish (Fig. 1a). In some experiments, the medium was replaced with FCS-free DMEM and cells were cultured for an additional 3-5 days. Just before microinjection, we trypsinized and washed the cells, and placed them in a drop of polyvinyl pyrrolidone-supplemented CZB medium2, 5, 6 on the microscope stage. Drawing them individually in and out of the injection pipette largely freed each nucleus from the cytoplasm. A single nucleus was injected into an enucleated oocyte, and such reconstructed oocytes were then activated with 10 mM Sr2+ 1-3 hours after nuclear transfer2. Embryos of 2-8 cells, morulae, or blastocysts were transferred into the oviducts or uteri of pseudo-pregnant mothers7 (CD-1, albino). We killed the females at 19.5 days post-coitum (dpc) and examined their uteri for the presence of fetuses and implantation sites. Live fetuses, delivered by caesarian section, were raised by lactating foster mothers (CD-1).

We found that 50-58% of the activated oocytes developed to morulae or blastocysts in vitro, but only 3 of 274 transferred embryos (1%) reached full term (Table 1). Three mice from tail-tip cells were born alive, all of them males with black eyes. Due to the very small number of live offspring obtained, however, the relationship between cloning success or failure and the culture condition and 1.31 and 1.35 g, respectively, at the time of birth; these weights are within the range for normal newborn mice. Two offspring died within one hour after caesarian section due to respiratory failure. The remaining male pup developed into a fertile adult male with the same agouti coat colour as the B6C3F1 tail-tip cell donor. As oocytes of B6D2F1 mice do not carry the agouti mutation, we conclude that the agouti offspring were derived from B6C3F1 nuclei.

As in previous studies, we noted a difference in the size of cloned and normal fetal placentas (Fig. 1b,c). For cloned male mice (this study) the

placental
weight (means.d.) at 19.5 dpc was 0.300.08 g (n=3); it was 0.330.08 g (n=23) for female mice cloned using cumulus cell nuclei (unpublished data). These values are twofold higher than those of normal (non-cloned) fetuses ($P<0.01$, Student's t-test), as placental weights of normal male and female fetuses at 19.5 dpc were 0.120.02 g (n=10) and 0.150.03 g (n=11), respectively. On the other hand, there were no significant differences in the fetal
body weights at term between cloned and normal fetuses. Pre- and perinatal problems associated with cloning are not unique to the mouse. A high rate of
abortion throughout pregnancy, high birth weight and frequent perinatal death
are suspected to stem from incomplete nuclear reprogramming of donor cell nuclei after transfer4. It is conceivable that imprinted genes involved in the
regulation of placentation8, 9 escape complete 'reprogramming' following nuclear transfer and are aberrantly expressed during placental development. Thus incomplete communication between the placenta and embryo/fetus may be the major cause of the problems we have observed4, 10, although further investigation is needed.

Our results demonstrate that cloning using adult somatic cells is not restricted to
female or reproductive cells. Thus, it should be possible to 'store' mouse genomes in the form of cryopreserved adult somatic cells (such as tail-tip cells)
rather than gametes, zygotes or embryos. Moreover, precious animals of either
sex (for example, endangered species and transgenic11 animals) can be propagated by cloning irrespective of their fertility status.

REFERENCES

1.Wilmut, I. et al. Nature 385, 810-813 (1997). MEDLINE

2.Wakayama, T. et al. Nature 394, 369-374 (1998). MEDLINE

3.Kato, Y. et al. Science 282, 2095-2098 (1998). MEDLINE

4.Wells, D.N. et al. Biol. Reprod. 60, 996-1005 (1999). MEDLINE

5.Chatot, C.L. et al. Biol. Reprod. 42, 432-440 (1990). MEDLINE

6.Kimura, Y. & Yanagimachi, R. Development 121, 2397-2405
(1995). MEDLINE

7.Hogan, B. et al. Manipulating the Mouse Embryo, 173-181 (Cold
Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, Cold Spring Harbor, 1994).

8.Baker, J. et al. Cell 75, 73-82 (1993). MEDLINE

9.Guillemot, F. et al. Nature Genet. 9, 235-242 (1995). MEDLINE
10.Spindle, A. et al. Dev. Biol. 173, 447-458 (1996). MEDLINE
11.Baguisi, A. et al. Nature Biotech. 17, 456-461 (1999).
MEDLINE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank P. Mombaerts, J.M. Bedford and A.C.F. Perry for comments and helpful discussion and ProBio America Inc. for support.

****

Carol W. Greider, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine
617 Hunterian Building
725 N. Wolfe Street
Baltimore, MD 21205

e-mail: cgreider@jhmi.edu
phone: (410) 614-6506
fax: (410) 614-2987

****

There is something fascinating about science. One gets such wholesale returns of conjecture out of such a trifling investment of fact.
- Mark Twain

****

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "r. alta charo" <racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu> ("r. alta charo" <racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-JUN-1999 19:30:59.00

SUBJECT: Re: fyi on cloning, with a query

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
thanks to carol, steve and david for the clarifications.

strikes me as a bit more sensationalist than it needed to be in the reporting...

At 16:03 6/1/99 -0800, you wrote:
>So here is what is new- that the somatic cell used for the somatic cell
>nuclear transfer was from the TAIL of an adult mouse, instead of a
>specialized cell type that surrounds the oocyte (ie. follicle cells). All
>prior work using mice for somatic cell nuclear transfer had used these
>somewhat specialized follicular somatic cells rather than a run of the mill
>adult tail cell. I hope this helps clarify the science.
>
>David
>

---

r. alta charo, j.d.
professor of law & medical ethics

electronic addresses:
racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu
http://www.law.wisc.edu/faculty/charoalt.htm

telephonic addresses:
608-262-5015 (tel)
608-262-5485 (fax)

postal address:
university of wisconsin law school
7111 law building
975 bascom mall
madison, wisconsin 53706 usa

- att1.htm========== ATTACHMENT 1 ==========
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
<html> thanks to carol, steve and david for the
clarifications.

strikes me as a bit more sensationalist than it needed to be in the
reporting...

At 16:03 6/1/99 -0800, you wrote:
>So here is what is new- that the somatic cell used for the
somatic cell
>nuclear transfer was from the TAIL of an adult mouse, instead of
a
>specialized cell type that surrounds the oocyte (ie. follicle
cells). All
>prior work using mice for somatic cell nuclear transfer had used
these
>somewhat specialized follicular somatic cells rather than a run
of the mill
>adult tail cell. I hope this helps clarify the science.
>
>David
>

---

r. alta charo, j.d.
professor of law & medical ethics

electronic addresses:
racharo@facstaff.wisc.edu
http://
www.law.wisc.edu/faculty/charoalt.htm

telephonic addresses:
608-262-5015 (tel)
608-262-5485 (fax)

postal address:
university of wisconsin law school
7111 law building
975 bascom mall
madison, wisconsin 53706 usa<x-tab>   </x-tab>

</html>

========== END ATTACHMENT 1 ==========

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Giles Martin <G.Martin@library.usyd.edu.au> (Giles Martin <G.Martin@library.usyd.edu.au> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JUN-1999 21:16:13.00

SUBJECT: Re: Classifying cloning items with DDC21

TO: AUTOCAT@LISTSERV.ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU (AUTOCAT@LISTSERV.ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
I think the problem is that "cloning" has enlarged in meaning since it was first used at the start of this century to mean the propagating of plants by means of their vegetative parts (in DDC 571.89 "Vegetative reproduction"). The commonest meaning now is the use of genetic material in somatic cells to create new organisms -- animals as well as plants. At 576.5, DDC calls this "gene cloning", and points you in the direction of 660.65 (Genetic engineering).

So if you have comprehensive works on the latter form of cloning -- the sort of cloning that was used to make the sheep Dolly -- then the best place for them is 660.65. However, for comprehensive works on both forms of cloning, I'd use 571.89.

Incidentally, 174.957 no longer means "Occupational ethics (Genetic engineering)". The entry for 174.9 was corrected in November 1998, and re-corrected in January 1999 because of an error in the first correction (see:
<http://www.oclc.org/oclc/fp/ddc/lcsh/new0199.htm>
). It now reads:

>174.9 Other professions and occupations
> Add to base number 174.9 notation 09-99 from Table 7, e.g., bioethics
> 174.957; however, for ethics of public administration and public office, see
> 172.2

As a result, occupational ethics of genetic engineering would go to either 174.25 or 174.966.

Giles

At 11:11 AM 6/7/99 -0400, Catherine Mason wrote:
>Hello fellow catalogers,
>
>Our library has recently received several comprehensive works on cloning. =
>We have had some discussion on where to place them in the collection and =
>would like some imput from the rest of the cataloging world before we make =

>a final decision.
>
>The numbers we are considering are:
>660.6 -- Biotechnology (the front runner at this time)
>572.86 -- DNA
>571.89 -- Vegetative reproduction (DLC recommended)
>174.957 -- Occupational ethics (Genetic engineering)
>
>Depending on content, we have books in all of these numbers. However, it
=
>is the comprehensive works that are causing the hub-bub.

Giles Martin
University of Sydney
home: (02) 4961 1972
work: (02) 9351 5589
e-mail: <g.martin@library.usyd.edu.au>

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Carol Greider <cgreider@jhmi.edu> (Carol Greider <cgreider@jhmi.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-JUN-1999 15:13:20.00

SUBJECT: From Nature June 3

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
FYI-

Republican hits out at stem-cell ethics report
[WASHINGTON] A prominent Republican member of the House of Representatives has attacked last month's finding by President Bill Clinton's National Bioethics Advisory Commission that the government should fund embryonic stem-cell research and the extraction of such cells (see Nature 399, 292; 1999).

Tom Bliley (Republican, Virginia), chair of the committee that oversees the National Institutes of Health, said it would hold hearings on the commission's findings. "I am gravely disappointed that the commission did not recommend exploring substitutes to using human embryos for scientific experimentations," Bliley said in a statement.

****

Carol W. Greider, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine
617 Hunterian Building
725 N. Wolfe Street
Baltimore, MD 21205

e-mail: cgreider@jhmi.edu
phone: (410) 614-6506
fax: (410) 614-2987

****

There is something fascinating about science. One gets such wholesale returns of conjecture out of such a trifling investment of fact.
- Mark Twain
****

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: kramer <bkramers@worldnet.att.net> (kramer <bkramers@worldnet.att.net> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-JUN-1999 22:36:59.00

SUBJECT: Re: suggestion for chapter 3

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Carol Greider wrote:
>
> NBAC-
> Harold asked me to look at where in the report things needed to be
> changed to address my concern that IVF created embryos and SCNT
> embryos are not the same.
>
> I made a number of suggestions about changes in chapter 2 and chapter
> 6 yesterday on the computers at the meeting. I realized however,
> reading the report again on the way home, that chapter 3 also has a
> secion on SCNT. I suggest omiting from page 20 line 19 to the end of
> that section. I have written an alternative section that follows
> below.
>
> I am also Faxing some additional minor changes to Kathi in chapter 3
> that address this issue. any suggestions or revisions to this text is
> welcome.
>
> Somatic cell nuclear transfer of a diploid nucleus into an oocyte has
> also been suggested as a method to generate embryos from which ES
> cells could be derived. Tissues derived from such cells would be
> useful in avoiding graft rejection if the donor nucleus were taken
> from the patient who will receive the tissue. While fertilization of
> an egg with a sperm in vitro clearly results in a human zygote that
> will divide to become and embryo, and has the potential to develop
> into a human if implanted, it is less clear whether the embryo created
> by SCNT has that potential. The fact that this technique can produce
> living animals such as sheep and cows argues that it is likely that
> the cell which results from insertion of an adult nucleus into an
> oocyte is a zygote and can become an embryo. However some have argued
> that it is not clear that a zygote produced in this manner is similar
> to an embryos created by fertilization since there are significant
> differences in the ability to generate different animals in these
> experiment and we do not know the potential of the human cell. Because
> NBAC and others have concluded that there are moral concerns that
> should preclude the generation of a child by SCNT at this time (ref
> cloning report), it is not possible to know whether the cell created
> in this manner has the potential to become a human. Because of the
> previous animal work showing the potential of SCNT to create an animal
> in some situations, many would argue that similar concerns about the

> creation of embryos for research purposes apply to embryos created by
> SCNT. Thus because of moral concerns outlined above about the creation
> of life for research purpose only, this category of research is
> disturbing to some people. Research in the future however my define
> conditions under which SCNT can be carried out while culturing the
> cells in such a manner that the resulting cell is immediately directed
> to differentiate in to a specific tissue and thus preclude further
> development into an embryo Thus perhaps, in the future, it will be
> possible to use SCNT into an oocyte without the creation of an embryo.
>
> One major distinction between IVF and SCNT embryos is that while
> creation of embryos by IVF would only generate more embryos,
> generation of embryos by SCNT would generate a specific kind of cell
> which might be very useful in treating disease by allowing autologous
> transplant of a specific tissue type. Thus in balancing issue of moral
> concern over the creation of an embryo and the value to society of the
> SCNT embryo, the potential therapeutic value uses of ES cells from
> SCNT embryos needs to be evaluated carefully. At the present time
> there is not sufficient scientific evidence to evaluate this
> potential, however within the next several years such information
> should accumulate.
>
> **********
>
> Carol W. Greider, Ph.D.
> Professor
> Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics
> Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine
> 617 Hunterian Building
> 725 N. Wolfe Street
> Baltimore, MD 21205
>
> e-mail: cgreider@jhmi.edu
> phone: (410) 614-6506
> fax: (410) 614-2987
>
> **********
>
> There is something fascinating about science. One gets such wholesale
> returns of conjecture out of such a trifling investment of fact.
> - Mark Twain
> **********

Thanks Carol. Do you think we ought to add some words of caution about foreclosing this research? Is that doable without endorsing the creation of embryos? Is there some intermediate position that can be endorsed? Bette

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Carol Greider <cgreider@jhmi.edu> (Carol Greider <cgreider@jhmi.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-JUN-1999 12:17:57.00

SUBJECT: suggestion for chapter 3

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
NBAC-
Harold asked me to look at where in the report things needed to be changed to address my concern that IVF created embryos and SCNT embryos are not the same.

I made a number of suggestions about changes in chapter 2 and chapter 6 yesterday on the computers at the meeting. I realized however, reading the report again on the way home, that chapter 3 also has a secion on SCNT. I suggest omiting from page 20 line 19 to the end of that section. I have written an alternative section that follows below.

I am also Faxing some additional minor changes to Kathi in chapter 3 that address this issue. any suggestions or revisions to this text is welcome.

Somatic cell nuclear transfer of a diploid nucleus into an oocyte has also been suggested as a method to generate embryos from which ES cells could be derived. Tissues derived from such cells would be useful in avoiding graft rejection if the donor nucleus were taken from the patient who will receive the tissue. While fertilization of an egg with a sperm in vitro clearly results in a human zygote that will divide to become and embryo, and has the potential to develop into a human if implanted, it is less clear whether the embryo created by SCNT has that potential. The fact that this technique can produce living animals such as sheep and cows argues that it is likely that the cell which results from insertion of an adult nucleus into an oocyte is a zygote and can become an embryo. However some have argued that it is not clear that a zygote produced in this manner is similar to an embryos created by fertilization since there are significant differences in the ability to generate different animals in these experiment and we do not know the potential of the human cell. Because NBAC and others have concluded that there are moral concerns that should preclude the generation of a child by SCNT at this time (ref cloning report), it is not possible to know whether the cell created in this manner has the potential to become a human. Because of the previous animal work showing the potential of SCNT to create an animal in some situations, many would argue that similar concerns about the creation of embryos for research purposes apply to embryos created by SCNT. Thus because of moral concerns outlined above about the creation of life for research purpose only, this category of research is disturbing to some people. Research in the future however my define conditions under which

SCNT can be carried out while culturing the cells in such a manner that the resulting cell is immediately directed to differentiate in to a specific tissue and thus preclude further development into an embryo Thus perhaps, in the future, it will be possible to use SCNT into an oocyte without the creation of an embryo.

One major distinction between IVF and SCNT embryos is that while creation of embryos by IVF would only generate more embryos, generation of embryos by SCNT would generate a specific kind of cell which might be very useful in treating disease by allowing autologous transplant of a specific tissue type. Thus in balancing issue of moral concern over the creation of an embryo and the value to society of the SCNT embryo, the potential therapeutic value uses of ES cells from SCNT embryos needs to be evaluated carefully. At the present time there is not sufficient scientific evidence to evaluate this potential, however within the next several years such information should accumulate.

****

Carol W. Greider, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine
617 Hunterian Building
725 N. Wolfe Street
Baltimore, MD 21205

e-mail: cgreider@jhmi.edu
phone: (410) 614-6506
fax: (410) 614-2987

****

There is something fascinating about science. One gets such wholesale returns of conjecture out of such a trifling investment of fact.
- Mark Twain

****

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Richard Sclove <Sclove@loka.org> (Richard Sclove <Sclove@loka.org> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-SEP-1999 01:44:12.00

SUBJECT: Fw: 2nd Korean Consensus Conference on Cloning

TO: Multiple.Recipients.of.the.Conference.Pol-Sci-Tech@igc.org (Multiple.Recipients.of.the.Conference.Pol-Sci-Tech@igc.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
<pol-sci-tech@igc.apc.org>
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id VAA22296
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (32)
X-Sender: loscott@email.eden.rutgers.edu

----- Original Message -----
From: ñ?¯¢?? <jhl1513@nownuri.net>
To: <ta-method@tekno.dk>
Sent: Friday, September 10, 1999 10:11 PM
Subject: 2nd Korean Consensus Conference on Cloning - 2

Dear Colleagues,
Sorry for late posting.
Cheers, Sang-Hyun

-

The 2nd Korean Consensus Conference on Cloning
September 10-13
Hosted by the Korean National Commission for UNESCO
September, 1999, Seoul, Korea

We are pleased to inform you that the 2nd Korean Consensus Conference will take place from September 10-13, 1999, at the Allen Bldg., Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea. Organized and hosted by the Korean National Commission for UNESCO (KNCU), this year's conference aims to provide a forum for dialogue between experts and lay citizens on the issue of Cloning, thereby contributing to a well-informed, democratic public discussion of the subject.

Modeled on the Danish experiments, KNCU held the 1st Korean Consensus Conference on the Safety & Ethics of Genetically Modified Foods in November 1998. This was the first attempt to introduce a participatory technology assessment into Korea. Despite the lack of financial and administrative support and the cultural gap between

Scandinavian countries and Korea, it was largely successfuland KNCU decided to organize the 2nd Korean Consensus Conference.

This year 16 members of the citizen panel were recruited via national newspapers, radio and internet and were selected from over 80 volunteers according to gender, age and other criteria - 8 men and 8 women, aged from 20s to 50s. The citizen panel formulated the conference questions after two preparatory meetings in July and August 1999. The expert panel consists of medical scientists, law experts, ethicists, theologians, social scientists, and NGO representatives.

During the first two days of the program, the expert panel will deliver statements on various aspects of 'Cloning' and answer questions from the citizen panel. On the last day,the citizen panel will present its final report in the press conference.

<<The Conference Program>>

The 2nd Korean Consensus Conference on Cloning
September 10-13
Allen Bldg., Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea

Friday, September 10
10:00-10:30 Opening Address
10:30-10:40 Welcome
10:40-11:00 Congratulations
11:00-11:20 Introduction of Citizen and Expert Panels
11:20-11:30 Break
11:30-12:30 Presentations 1, 2 & Citizen Panel's Questions
12:30-13:30 Lunch
13:30-15:00 Presentations 3, 4, 5 & Citizen Panel's Questions
15:00-15:10 Break
15:10-16:40 Presentations 6, 7, 8 & Citizen Panel's Questions
16:40-16:50 Break
16:50-18:20 Presentations 9, 10, 11 & Citizen Panel's Questions
18:20-19:30 Dinner & Break
19:30- Citizen Panel: Evaluation & Formulating Supplementary Questions

Saturday, September 11
14:00-15:50 Citizen Panel Supplementary Questions & Expert Panel Response 1
15:50-16:00 Break
16:00-18:00 Citizen Panel Supplementary Questions & Expert Panel Response 2
18:00-19:30 Dinner
19:30- Citizen Panel: Evaluation & Discussion

Sunday, September 12
Citizen Panel: Preparation of the final report

Monday, September 13
10:00-10:30 Presentation of Citizen Panel Report
10:30-11:30 Press Conference

<< Conference Questions >>

1. What is Cloning?
2. What are the potential benefits of Cloning?
3. What are the potential negative impacts of Cloning?
4. What is Life?
5. Should Cloning be allowed? (Animal or Human Cloning; Non-Reproductive or Reproductive Cloning)
6. What are the vested interests in Cloning Research?
7. Do we have a proper legislation for Cloning in Korea? What are the current regulatory systems for Cloning in other countries?
8. To what extent do we need citizen participation in the policy deliberation related to Cloning, and how can we accomplishit?
9. What are the social and ethical responsibilities in science, and how can we promote these among scientists and lay citizens?
10. What is the role of religious communities in the Cloning debate?

Further inquiries shouldbe addressed to:

Prof. Hwansuk Kim
Conference Coordinator
Department of Sociology
Kookmin University
Seoul, Korea
E-mail: kimhs@kmu.kookmin.ac.kr

Mr Jae-kak Han
Program Officer
Science & Communication Unit,
Korean National Commission for UNESCO,
Seoul, Korea
E-mail: hanclk@mail.unesco.or.kr

Homepage: http://www.unesco.or.kr/cc/

-

Sang-Hyun Kim
Department of Sociology
University of Edinburgh
18 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh EH8 9LN
United Kingdom
E-mail: s.kim-2@sms.ed.ac.uk
jhl1513@nownuri.net
Tel: +44-(0)131-220-1964 (Home)

+44-(0)131-650-8494 (Office)

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Larry Miike <lhmiike@aloha.com> (Larry Miike <lhmiike@aloha.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-SEP-1999 23:04:07.00

SUBJECT: priorities

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Having read Tom's and Arturo's comments, and also having attended last week's meeting, where the few of us there discussed priority-setting, I vote for the following: gene patenting, reproductive technologies, research on children, and human-nonhuman combination therapies, which could include the xenotransplantation issue brought up by a letter to the Commission. On the latter, I believe it would be useful for us to take an ethical look at exactly what types of nonhuman derived biological materials are ethically justified, and which are not. We have already said that cloning human beings is not, although we have not committed to a "forever" position on this, so it would be useful to take a look at the whole range of possibilities from an ethical perspective.

Having said this, I think three would be a good number to get started on and finish by the end of the year 2000, and we seem set on at least gene patenting. Also, we discussed at the meeting a separate report on human subjects protection, including the Common Rule, a topic on which much of the preparation has already taken place. So if we can finish the International project by the end of this year and the human subjects report sometime in the spring, we would have a full and satisfactory plate. Of course, we will also be subject to whatever the current hot topic is.
larry
- att1.htm========== ATTACHMENT 1 ==========
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1" http-equiv=Content-Type>
<META content="MSHTML 5.00.2614.3500" name=GENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT size=2>Having read Tom's and Arturo's comments, and also having attended last week's meeting, where the few of us there discussed priority-setting, I vote for the following: gene patenting, reproductive technologies, research on children, and human-nonhuman combination therapies,

which could include the xenotransplantation issue brought up by a letter to the

Commission. On the latter, I believe it would be useful for us to take an

ethical look at exactly what types of nonhuman derived biological materials are

ethically justified, and which are not. We have already said that cloning human

beings is not, although we have not committed to a "forever" position on this,

so it would be useful to take a look at the whole range of possibilities from a
n
ethical perspective.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2></FONT> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>Having said this, I think three would be a good number to get

started on and finish by the end of the year 2000, and we seem set on at least

gene patenting. Also, we discussed at the meeting a separate report on
human subjects protection, including the Common Rule, a topic on which much of

the preparation has already taken place. So if we can finish the
International project by the end of this year and the human subjects report
sometime in the spring, we would have a full and satisfactory plate. Of

course, we will also be subject to whatever the current hot topic
is.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>larry</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>

========== END ATTACHMENT 1 ==========

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Patricia Backlar <backlarp@irn.pdx.edu> (Patricia Backlar <backlarp@irn.pdx.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-NOV-1999 16:04:47.00

SUBJECT: Re: Some mail you will have received

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Hello Eric,
Yes, it is nice to receive reading material in batches. Thank you. I was especially pleased to read Elisa's excellent--and extremely interesting and useful--update on human cloning.
Trish

Patricia Backlar
Research Associate Professor of Bioethics
Departments of Sociology and Philosophy
Portland State University
POB 751
Portland OR 97207
503/725 -3499 (voice)
503/725-3693 (fax)
backlarp@pdx.edu (email)

>>> "Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> 11/12/99 12:47PM >>>
Commissioners--

In our effort to make the flow of materials we send a little less lumpy (i.e., little bits and often, rather than piles) you will be receiving--or have already received--a package containing the following:

1. The recent GAO report on NIH Clinical Trials:Various Factors Affect Patient Population. (Some of you couldn't download this).

2. A copy of the recent discussion paper by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics, entitled "The ethics of clinical research in developing countries". It was the result of a workshop last February (that Ruth Macklin attended).

The Nuffield will be undertaking a major inquiry on this issue, which in their parlance means that they will be writing a full report. Their project begins in

the spring and will likely take 18 months. I have already closely coordinated with Sandy Thomas, their executive director, so she is aware of what we're doing as well. It is possible we may invite her (or a Nuffield Council member) to a future NBAC meeting.

3. A copy of Elisa Eiseman's paper, Cloning Human Beings: Recent Scientific and Policy Developments. This was a paper we asked Elisa to prepare in the event the White House asked NBAC for an update on our Cloning report. They never asked, but Elisa completed the report anyway. This is a model I want to continue with our other reports. Some of you already received copies from Elisa.

Eric

Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
Executive Director
National Bioethics Advisory Commission
6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
Tel: (301) 402-4242
Fax: (301) 480-6900
Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
http://www.bioethics.gov

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> ("Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-NOV-1999 15:50:40.00

SUBJECT: Some mail you will have received

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Commissioners--

In our effort to make the flow of materials we send a little less lumpy (i.e., little bits and often, rather than piles) you will be receiving--or have already received--a package containing the following:

1. The recent GAO report on NIH Clinical Trials:Various Factors Affect Patient Population. (Some of you couldn't download this).

2. A copy of the recent discussion paper by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics, entitled "The ethics of clinical research in developing countries". It was the result of a workshop last February (that Ruth Macklin attended).

The Nuffield will be undertaking a major inquiry on this issue, which in their parlance means that they will be writing a full report. Their project begins in the spring and will likely take 18 months. I have already closely coordinated with Sandy Thomas, their executive director, so she is aware of what we're doing as well. It is possible we may invite her (or a Nuffield Council member) to a future NBAC meeting.

3. A copy of Elisa Eiseman's paper, Cloning Human Beings: Recent Scientific and Policy Developments. This was a paper we asked Elisa to prepare in the event the White House asked NBAC for an update on our Cloning report. They never asked, but Elisa completed the report anyway. This is a model I want to continue with our other reports. Some of you already received copies from Elisa.

Eric

Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
Executive Director
National Bioethics Advisory Commission
6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
Tel: (301) 402-4242
Fax: (301) 480-6900
Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
http://www.bioethics.gov

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas Murray <murrayt@thehastingscenter.org> (Thomas Murray <murrayt@thehastingscenter.org> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-NOV-1999 18:44:54.00

SUBJECT: RE: priority setting

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Thanks to Larry for the interesting parsing of issues. They are less futuristic than one might imagine at first, and they do indeed raise fascinating and fundamental questions about species identity and the grounds
for moral respect of different sorts, among other matters.

Tom
-----Original Message-----
From: owner-nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU [mailto:owner-nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU]On Behalf Of Larry Miike
Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 1999 2:44 PM
To: NBAC Members E-list
Subject: priority setting

I note that we do not have any time set aside at the next meeting for further discussion on other possible projects. Okay with me, but I had said
at the last meeting that I would comment further on a study of human/nonhuman combinations. I offer the following synopsis on how such a study might proceed.

What do we mean? Incorporation of organs, tissues, cells or genes of human or nonhuman (usually animal) origins into its counterpart living organism.

Categories:
1) To produce commercial products; i.e., human genes for insulin into yeast cells or cow mammary glands to produce commercial quantities.
Essentially not an issue, with concerns limited to safety and efficacy. (Although safety is included in any ethical analysis, safety alone is not a reason enough to make it an NBAC area of expertise. In our cloning study, safety was the primary reason why we callef for a moratorium;
but we recommended a moratorium -- and not an outright ban or approval -- as
a way to give our society time to sort out which way it would come down on those ethical issues.) Note that the use of the resulting product may be controversial, even within species as with enhancing milk production, but

the concern is still over safety.

2) To implant organs, tissues, cells or genes from animals into humans. Organs, tissues and cells raise safety issues, although as the letter from the Campaign for Responsible Transplantation reflects, also raises the issue
of animal rights. And of course, if human embryos are the recipients, that issue would be primary. I don't know if animal genes might be implanted into humans. If so, it raise issues beyond those arising with human-to-human gene therapy, because of intergenerational transmission. The
degree of criticality would be related to the specific gene(s) transplanted.

3) To implant organs, tissues, cells or genes from humans into animals. Similar to #2, including the animal rights issue. Probably quite common already in the research setting. Integenerational issue not as sensitive as
in #2, but there would be a threshold; i.e., when the offspring have the potential to exhibit human characteristics/traits and not only human biochemical/physiological responses.

4) Integration of human cells into animal ova, and of animal cells into human ova. Brings forth all of the issues of a) cloning and b) research with human embryos, with the added complexity of human-animal hybridization.
Scientifically, I understand that the two scenarios are different (i.e., except for mitochondrial dna, the genes control the ova), so the ethical issues also would be different. But it would be difficult to communicate the rationale for different conclusions for these two scenarios, because of the human-animal hybridization.

My initial conclusion is that human-animal combinations raise novel ethical issues: 1) if the line between humans and animals become blurred in the hybridization process; and 2) for animal rights advocates. The area which is more imminent and therefore perhaps most controversial is when human or animal ova are involved. This is not a novel issue, but complexifies the issues of cloning and research on human embryos.
- att1.htm========== ATTACHMENT 1 ==========
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META HTTP-EQUIV="Content-Type" CONTENT="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">

<META content="MSHTML 5.00.2314.1000" name=GENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT color=#0000ff face=Arial size=2><SPAN class=370552122-23111999>Thank
s
to Larry for the interesting parsing of issues. They are less futuristic

than one might imagine at first, and they do indeed raise fascinating and
fundamental questions about species identity and the grounds for moral respect

of different sorts, among other matters.</SPAN></FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT color=#0000ff face=Arial size=2><SPAN
class=370552122-23111999></SPAN></FONT> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT color=#0000ff face=Arial size=2><SPAN
class=370552122-23111999>Tom</SPAN></FONT></DIV>
<BLOCKQUOTE style="MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
<DIV align=left class=OutlookMessageHeader dir=ltr><FONT face=Tahoma
size=2>-----Original Message-----
<B>From:</B>
owner-nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU
[mailto:owner-nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU]<B>On Behalf Of </B>Larry
Miike
<B>Sent:</B> Tuesday, November 23, 1999 2:44 PM
<B>To:</B> NBAC

Members E-list
<B>Subject:</B> priority setting

</DIV></FONT>
<DIV><FONT size=2>I note that we do not have any time set aside at the next

meeting for further discussion on other possible projects. Okay with me
,
but I had said at the last meeting that I would comment further on a study of

human/nonhuman combinations. I offer the following synopsis on how such

a study might proceed.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>What do we mean? Incorporation of organs, tissues,
cells or genes of human or nonhuman (usually animal) origins into its
counterpart living organism.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>Categories:</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>1) To produce commercial products; i.e., human genes for
insulin into yeast cells or cow mammary glands to produce commercial
quantities.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2> Essentially not an issue, with concerns

limited to safety and efficacy. (Although safety is included in any
ethical analysis, safety alone is not a reason enough to make it an NBAC area

of expertise. In our cloning study, safety was the primary reason why w
e
callef for a moratorium; but we recommended a moratorium -- and not an
outright ban or approval -- as a way to give our society time to sort out
which way it would come down on those ethical issues.) Note that the us
e
of the resulting product may be controversial, even within species as with
enhancing milk production, but the concern is still over safety.</FONT></DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>2) To implant organs, tissues, cells or genes from animals

into humans. Organs, tissues and cells raise safety issues, although as

the letter from the Campaign for Responsible Transplantation reflects, also

raises the issue of animal rights. And of course, if human embryos are

the recipients, that issue would be primary. I don't know if animal
genes might be implanted into humans. If so, it raise issues beyond
those arising with human-to-human gene therapy, because of intergenerational

transmission. The degree of criticality would be related to the specifi
c
gene(s) transplanted.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>3) To implant organs, tissues, cells or genes from humans

into animals. Similar to #2, including the animal rights issue.

Probably quite common already in the research setting. Integenerational

issue not as sensitive as in #2, but there would be a threshold; i.e., when

the offspring have the potential to exhibit human characteristics/traits and

not only human biochemical/physiological responses.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>4) Integration of human cells into animal ova, and of

animal cells into human ova. Brings forth all of the issues of a)
cloning and b) research with human embryos, with the added complexity of
human-animal hybridization. Scientifically, I understand that the two

scenarios are different (i.e., except for mitochondrial dna, the genes contro
l
the ova), so the ethical issues also would be different. But it would b
e
difficult to communicate the rationale for different conclusions for these tw
o
scenarios, because of the human-animal hybridization.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>My initial conclusion is that human-animal combinations
raise novel ethical issues: 1) if the line between humans and animals become

blurred in the hybridization process; and 2) for animal rights
advocates. The area which is more imminent and therefore perhaps most

controversial is when human or animal ova are involved. This is not a

novel issue, but complexifies the issues of cloning and research on human
embryos.</FONT></DIV></BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>

========== END ATTACHMENT 1 ==========

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> ("Meslin, Eric (OD)" <MeslinE@od.nih.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-NOV-1999 15:26:02.00

SUBJECT: RE: priority setting

TO: NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> (NBAC Members E-list <nbac-members@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Larry (and Tom who also responded to this):

Thanks for putting together this proposal for a possible next project.
A quick note on the upcoming agenda and why it does not include discussion of
next projects, other than the "Oversight Project".

Some time ago, our intention was to discuss at the December meeting the two background papers (reprotech, and gene patenting) as part of the priority setting exercise. Neal Lane's remarks and explicit request of the commission
changed that planning. You'll recall Harold's specific direction that staff devote its attention to preparing for the oversight report and that two background papers were essentially warming on the back burner.Staff continues to
track these two issues (particularly since they may figure in to either the international or oversight projects), but there will not be any presentation on
them at the meeting. I think we should add Larry's to this list.

Harold's view is that our efforts in the near future will be focused on completing the international project and oversight projects.

Eric

Eric M. Meslin, Ph.D
Executive Director
National Bioethics Advisory Commission
6100 Executive Blvd. Suite 5B01
Rockville, Maryland 20892-7508
Tel: (301) 402-4242
Fax: (301) 480-6900
Email: MeslinE@OD.NIH.GOV
http://www.bioethics.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Miike [SMTP:lhmiike@aloha.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 1999 2:44 PM

To: NBAC Members E-list
Subject: priority setting

I note that we do not have any time set aside at the next meeting for further discussion on other possible projects. Okay with me, but I had said at the last meeting that I would comment further on a study of human/nonhuman combinations. I offer the following synopsis on how such a study might proceed.

What do we mean? Incorporation of organs, tissues, cells or genes of human or nonhuman (usually animal) origins into its counterpart living organism.

Categories:

1) To produce commercial products; i.e., human genes for insulin into yeast cells or cow mammary glands to produce commercial quantities.

Essentially not an issue, with concerns limited to safety and efficacy. (Although safety is included in any ethical analysis, safety alone is not a reason enough to make it an NBAC area of expertise. In our cloning study, safety was the primary reason why we callef for a moratorium; but we recommended a moratorium -- and not an outright ban or approval -- as a way to give our society time to sort out which way it would come down on those ethical issues.)
Note that the use of the resulting product may be controversial, even within species as with enhancing milk production, but the concern is still over safety.

2) To implant organs, tissues, cells or genes from animals into humans.
Organs, tissues and cells raise safety issues, although as the letter from the Campaign for Responsible Transplantation reflects, also raises the issue of animal rights. And of course, if human embryos are the recipients, that issue would be primary. I don't know if animal genes might be implanted into humans.
If so, it raise issues beyond those arising with human-to-human gene therapy, because of intergenerational transmission. The degree of criticality would be related to the specific gene(s) transplanted.

3) To implant organs, tissues, cells or genes from humans into animals.
Similar to #2, including the animal rights issue. Probably quite common already

in the research setting. Integenerational issue not as sensitive as in #2, but there would be a threshold; i.e., when the offspring have the potential to exhibit human characteristics/traits and not only human biochemical/physiological responses.

4) Integration of human cells into animal ova, and of animal cells into human ova. Brings forth all of the issues of a) cloning and b) research with human embryos, with the added complexity of human-animal hybridization. Scientifically, I understand that the two scenarios are different (i.e., except for mitochondrial dna, the genes control the ova), so the ethical issues also would be different. But it would be difficult to communicate the rationale for different conclusions for these two scenarios, because of the human-animal hybridization.

My initial conclusion is that human-animal combinations raise novel ethical issues: 1) if the line between humans and animals become blurred in the hybridization process; and 2) for animal rights advocates. The area which is more imminent and therefore perhaps most controversial is when human or animal ova are involved. This is not a novel issue, but complexifies the issues of cloning and research on human embryos.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Keith Thurston <keith.thurston@GSA.GOV> (Keith Thurston <keith.thurston@GSA.GOV> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-JAN-2000 12:49:57.00

SUBJECT: CIO-PRIVACY: POTUS on privacy and new FTC committee

TO: CIO-PRIVACY-SUBCOMMITTEE@WWW.GSA.GOV (CIO-PRIVACY-SUBCOMMITTEE@WWW.GSA.GOV [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
OMB/ Peter Swire's Update :

In the interests of keeping people up to date on privacy matters, here are two items: (1) privacy statements by the President on Friday; and (2) creation of a new FTC privacy advisory committee on access and security issues.

On Friday, the President gave a speech at Cal Tech on new science and technology initiatives. In the course of the discussion on genetic and information technology, the President made statements on privacy, including a mention of the word "profiles" that a couple of agencies had emphasized in prior meetings. The relevant paragraphs:

Finally, I think we have to do a better job of having an open debate about the responsibilities that all these advances and discoveries will clearly impose: The same genetic revolution that can offer new hope for millions of Americans could also be used to deny people health insurance; cloning human beings; information technology which helps to educate children and provide telemedicine to rural communities could also be used to create disturbingly detailed profiles of every move our citizens make on line.

The federal government, I think, has a role to play in meeting these challenges as well. That's why we've put forward strict rules and penalties to limit the use and release of medical records; why we've worked with Congress to ban the cloning of human beings, while preserving our ability to use the morally and medically acceptable applications of cloning technology, which I believe are profoundly important; why we're working with the Internet industry to ensure that consumers -- consumers -- have control over how their personal information is used.

On a different matter, the FTC has just announced the list of 40 private-sector persons on its formal Advisory Committee on online access and security issues. This committee is intended to continue the FTC's efforts to understand how to implement privacy fair information practices. The FTC's announcement is available at http://www.ftc.gov/opa/2000/01/asrev.htm.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: James Kevin Watkins <kwatkins3@aol.com> (James Kevin Watkins <kwatkins3@aol.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-OCT-2000 16:47:32.00

SUBJECT: Inbound-White_House_WWW_MAIL => MRS_GORE

TO: mrs.gore@Whitehouse.GOV (mrs.gore@Whitehouse.GOV [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
[Connection Information]

CLIENT: 206.222.96.195[206.222.96.195]
BROWSER: Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE 4.01; Windows NT)
URL:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/Mail/html/Mail_Mrs_Gore.html

[Sender Information]

PERSONAL-NAME: James Kevin Watkins
EMAIL-ADDRESS: kwatkins3@aol.com
ORGANIZATION:
RELATIONSHIP:
STREET-ADDRESS: 106 Woodgate Drive
CITY: Elmore
STATE-PROVINCE: AL
ZIP-CODE: 36025
COUNTRY: USA

[Message Information]

PURPOSE: Other
TOPIC: Problem Assistance
AFFILIATION: Private Citizen
SUBJECT: Human Cloning

[Message]

Paul Harvey reported last week that somewhere in America within 10 days a human would be cloned. He reported a company/organization by the name of Clone Aid reported they had the technology and resources to perform this tragic act. They apparently said they had been approached by a family who had lost their daughter and wanted her cloned. I thought we had already passed legislation to keep this from happening. I applaud the amount of knowledge that has been granted by God in the area of Science Technology, but this is an attempt to play God. Please investigate this report from Paul Harvey on Friday October 13th, 2000. Then let's move to put a stop to this un-natural act.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ashlee Sligh <ashleesligh@hotmail.com> (Ashlee Sligh <ashleesligh@hotmail.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-NOV-2000 09:07:34.00

SUBJECT: Human genetic engineering

TO: feedback@Whitehouse.GOV (feedback@Whitehouse.GOV [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Hello,
I was looking at your website to find useful information about human
genetic
engineering. I am writing a report on designer babies and whether or not it should be allowed. I was wondering if there are any current laws banning genetic engineering. I saw the laws on human cloning but I was looking for specific laws on human genetic engineering dealing with designer babies.

Thank you,
Ashlee Sligh

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: David_Rostker@omb.eop.gov (David_Rostker@omb.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-NOV-2000 18:22:32.00

SUBJECT: Re: Tired of waiting for the second coming?

TO: zygmuntchat E-list <zygmuntchat@lists.Princeton.EDU> (zygmuntchat E-list <zygmuntchat@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
What about those of us still waiting for the First?

There is a certain irony in the idea of using modern technology to bring back such a major religious figure. Particularly since many of the ultra-religious (and quite a few not-so-religious) consider cloning and all such biotechnology to be an abomination of the natural order (a.k.a. "playing God"). Somehow, I think cloning Jesus might cause more damage to Christianity than good since a clone would never have the legitimacy of the original (or at least the legendary original).

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Martha Elena Galinski <meg611@core.com> (Martha Elena Galinski <meg611@core.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-NOV-2000 21:20:21.00

SUBJECT: RE: Tired of waiting for the second coming?

TO: zygmuntchat E-list <zygmuntchat@lists.Princeton.EDU> (zygmuntchat E-list <zygmuntchat@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
I checked the site out and I think it's ridiculous, for both scientific and religious reasons.

1. Blood cells (red blood cells for sure, and maybe others) don't have a full complement of DNA. I do remember that the red blood cells get rid of their nucleus before they are sent out into the bloodstream. Hair cells and skin cells are dead, by the time they're hair or skin(does this make a difference?)I'm not sure they could even be used for cloning. Has any cloning been done to date from those kinds of cells?

2. The Shroud of Turin, according to microscopic analysis of particles on it, was painted in the 14th century. A venerated icon, but not likely to be a source of DNA. The Holy Cross has been divided into so many pieces it would be very difficult to find the ones if any (see #1) which had usable DNA. After all, it wouldn't have been doused in His Blood - only a few pieces would have any. I can't vouch for the genuineness or not of the other
mentioned relics. I suppose one would have to compare any DNA found and try to make sure it all came from the same person - if more than one, would you clone them all?

3. Following Jesus' resurrection, he had a very different body from his prior one and from any ordinary human body. Witness the fact that he appeared in the midst of the disciples as they were meeting behind closed doors, and was on a number of occasions, not immediately recognized. I.e. he
could pass through matter (or materialize and dematerialize), and change his
appearance. I don't know of any relics from this portion of his life, and I don't think that could be cloned!

4. Following Jesus' acension, angels told the apostles (and this is later re-iterated by Paul and others) that he would come back the same way he had left, i.e. from the sky, in the clouds. NOT by being cloned!

5. Even if you could find DNA, verify it was Jesus' and use it to make a clone, that would not be him, as he was both God and man. It would just be man (if that).

Tired of waiting for the second coming? Be glad God is that patient! I
can't
imagine that any of us in the light of truth is so righteous as to be eager
to be judged!

Elena
-----Original Message-----
From: owner-zygmuntchat@lists.Princeton.EDU
[mailto:owner-zygmuntchat@lists.Princeton.EDU]On Behalf Of Norman Grogin
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2000 5:22 PM
To: zygmuntchat E-list
Subject: Re: Tired of waiting for the second coming?

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Scott Berger <berger@rice.edu> (Scott Berger <berger@rice.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-NOV-2000 20:43:44.00

SUBJECT: The spiritual legitimacy of the human clone, as distinct from the morality of the cloner

TO: zygmuntchat E-list <zygmuntchat@lists.Princeton.EDU> (zygmuntchat E-list <zygmuntchat@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
> On Sun, 19 Nov 2000, Martha Elena Galinski wrote:
> > 5. Even if you could find DNA, verify it was Jesus' and use it to make a
> > clone, that would not be him, as he was both God and man. It would just be
> > man (if that).
^^^^^^^^^

The act of cloning a human is the subject of moral investigation, and human cloning may be sinful or evil or whatever. However, I would argue the moral and spiritual legitimacy of the human clone as a person should not be in doubt.

Are children born of C-section, test tube, or genetic modification denied the love of God? Does God disenfranchise children born of serial killers, rapists, mass-murderers? Is the test tube baby cursed by the sin of the evil mad scientist? -- Or is God loving or judging each person by their own actions, merits, and beliefs?

A clone is an independent living being who has a separate and distinct identity in every respect except genetic code. The clone is an identical twin with different chronological age and heritage and upbringing. I'm certainly not an authority on human souls, but I hadn't seen any evidence that God would reject some biological humans as soul-less homunculi on the basis of the nature of their conception alone.

(From this perspective as well, the clonejesus project would not be successful. A clone of Jesus would not be Jesus, it would be Jesus' identical twin. It wouldn't be the Second Coming, it would be the first time around for a sibling that Jesus never had.)

--Scott
berger@math.rice.edu

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Dmitry Gorenburg <gorenbur@alumni.Princeton.EDU> (Dmitry Gorenburg <gorenbur@alumni.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-NOV-2000 08:24:17.00

SUBJECT: RE: Tired of waiting for the second coming?

TO: zygmuntchat E-list <zygmuntchat@lists.Princeton.EDU> (zygmuntchat E-list <zygmuntchat@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
The site is a parody, right? That's how I interpreted it, anyway.

Dima

At 08:19 PM 11/19/2000 -0600, you wrote:
>I checked the site out and I think it's ridiculous, for both scientific
and
>religious reasons.
>
>1. Blood cells (red blood cells for sure, and maybe others) don't have a
>full complement of DNA. I do remember that the red blood cells get rid of
>their nucleus before they are sent out into the bloodstream. Hair cells
and
>skin cells are dead, by the time they're hair or skin(does this make a
>difference?)I'm not sure they could even be used for cloning. Has any
>cloning been done to date from those kinds of cells?
>
>2. The Shroud of Turin, according to microscopic analysis of particles on
>it, was painted in the 14th century. A venerated icon, but not likely to
be
>a source of DNA. The Holy Cross has been divided into so many pieces it
>would be very difficult to find the ones if any (see #1) which had usable
>DNA. After all, it wouldn't have been doused in His Blood - only a few
>pieces would have any. I can't vouch for the genuineness or not of the
other
>mentioned relics. I suppose one would have to compare any DNA found and
try
>to make sure it all came from the same person - if more than one, would
you
>clone them all?
>
>3. Following Jesus' resurrection, he had a very different body from his
>prior one and from any ordinary human body. Witness the fact that he
>appeared in the midst of the disciples as they were meeting behind closed
>doors, and was on a number of occasions, not immediately recognized. I.e.
he
>could pass through matter (or materialize and dematerialize), and change
his

>appearance. I don't know of any relics from this portion of his life, and
I
>don't think that could be cloned!
>
>4. Following Jesus' acension, angels told the apostles (and this is later
>re-iterated by Paul and others) that he would come back the same way he
had
>left, i.e. from the sky, in the clouds. NOT by being cloned!
>
>5. Even if you could find DNA, verify it was Jesus' and use it to make a
>clone, that would not be him, as he was both God and man. It would just be
>man (if that).
>
>Tired of waiting for the second coming? Be glad God is that patient! I
can't
>imagine that any of us in the light of truth is so righteous as to be
eager
>to be judged!
>
>Elena
>-----Original Message-----
>From: owner-zygmuntchat@lists.Princeton.EDU
>[mailto:owner-zygmuntchat@lists.Princeton.EDU]On Behalf Of Norman Grogin
>Sent: Friday, November 17, 2000 5:22 PM
>To: zygmuntchat E-list
>Subject: Re: Tired of waiting for the second coming?

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Cathie Pfleger <cpfleger@fas.harvard.EDU> (Cathie Pfleger <cpfleger@fas.harvard.EDU> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-NOV-2000 10:34:37.00

SUBJECT: RE: Tired of waiting for the second coming?

TO: zygmuntchat E-list <zygmuntchat@lists.Princeton.EDU> (zygmuntchat E-list <zygmuntchat@lists.Princeton.EDU> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
for some reason, this email really rubbed me the wrong way, so i apologize in advance if i sound antagonistic in my response. also, the standard disclaimer about offending people -- i am not religious, and i don't mean to belittle anyone's beliefs or make fun of those who do hold such beliefs. having said that...

On Sun, 19 Nov 2000, Martha Elena Galinski wrote:

> I checked the site out and I think it's ridiculous, for both scientific and
> religious reasons.
>

dima's comment that i think the site is for parody/humorous purposes -- along the lines of cloning elvis, princess diana, and other figures that people loved dearly and whose loss is felt deeply mixed with the scientific possiblities now afforded us.

as for scientific absurdity -- i don't find as problematic as elena seems to.

> 1. Blood cells (red blood cells for sure, and maybe others) don't have a
> full complement of DNA. I do remember that the red blood cells get rid of
> their nucleus before they are sent out into the bloodstream. Hair cells and
> skin cells are dead, by the time they're hair or skin(does this make a
> difference?)I'm not sure they could even be used for cloning. Has any
> cloning been done to date from those kinds of cells?
>

true, red blood cells do not have nuclei, and therefore are without dna, but blood is not composed of merely red blood cells. white blood cells have nuclei, and are, as obvious by there name, in blood. i have not heard reports of using white blood cell nuclei in cloning, but still, the DNA is there, and the speculation is just as valid as using other nuclei.

there are reports of cloning from epithelial cells (like skin), but i

don't know how reliable they are. there are many types of skin cells -- those still dividing, and those which are not. even the surface layer "dead" ones still have DNA, as do dead hair cells, but i have nor heard much talk about cloning from dead cells. on the other hand, one could argue that if these are jesus's cells, anything is possible.

> 2. The Shroud of Turin, according to microscopic analysis of particles on
> it, was painted in the 14th century. A venerated icon, but not likely to be
> a source of DNA. The Holy Cross has been divided into so many pieces it
> would be very difficult to find the ones if any (see #1) which had usable
> DNA. After all, it wouldn't have been doused in His Blood - only a few
> pieces would have any. I can't vouch for the genuineness or not of the other
> mentioned relics. I suppose one would have to compare any DNA found and try
> to make sure it all came from the same person - if more than one, would you
> clone them all?

it'd be trivial enough (assuming one isolated the nuclei and useful DNA successfully) to distinguish between DNA from different individuals.

of course, if one were to believe those parts of christianity that believe that the wine becomes christ's blood and that wafer his body, it would be much more straightforward to isolate nuclei from those conditions -- it'd be fresher and one wouldn't have to worry over contaminating DNA. other areas of christianity see this as a metaphor rather than a reality, but it's one avenue to pursue.

granted, one could argue that it wouldn't work for a non-believer b/c faith is an element of the miracle, but i'm sure the researchers in question would be believers, otherwise they wouldn't be pursuing this avenue.

>
> 3. Following Jesus' resurrection, he had a very different body from his
> prior one and from any ordinary human body. Witness the fact that he
> appeared in the midst of the disciples as they were meeting behind closed
> doors, and was on a number of occasions, not immediately recognized. I.e. he
> could pass through matter (or materialize and dematerialize), and change his
> appearance. I don't know of any relics from this portion of his life, and I
> don't think that could be cloned!

one could argue that jesus is jesus, and that one is merely creating a vessel in which he could return. if he did return, and is a god, he could do what he wanted, have what power he wanted.

>

> 4. Following Jesus' acension, angels told the apostles (and this is later
> re-iterated by Paul and others) that he would come back the same way he
had
> left, i.e. from the sky, in the clouds. NOT by being cloned!

i really don't see how the two are mutually exclusive. i am not well-versed in biblical prophesies or texts, but so far as i know, there aren't a lot of details on the matter. jesus returning from the sky in the clouds is easily reconciled with his having been cloned. first of all, most countries have come out saying that they prohibit human cloning with their funding sources and within their borders (and yes, i acknowledge that you are asserting that jesus isn't human, but somehow i think that he would still fall within this designation for these purposes). anyone wanting to clone him might seek a lab and resources elsewhere -- in the future why not on a space station, thereby allowing jesus to return from the sky?

i don't believe any of the prophecies mention cloning, either specifically or by implication. furthermore, the god i've heard about in stories since i was little seems to appreciate innovation. there's that old phrase about the lord helping them that help themselves. i don't at all see it as outlandish that god would speak to a scientist (many might argue she already has -- darwin, einstein, hawking) in order to bring about the return of jesus. in today's world which lacks faith, and to many lacks much of anything to believe in, what better way to pave the way to a restoration of faith than to use science -- something that people will understand, and something that many cling to as their last foundation for hope and believability?

furthermore, many scientists are deeply religious people or deeply spiritual people without being religious. there's no reason that jesus can't return thru the aid of one or more of them. god does, after all, seem to have an affinity for speaking to tradespeople -- why not a scientist?

>
> 5. Even if you could find DNA, verify it was Jesus' and use it to make a
> clone, that would not be him, as he was both God and man. It would just
be
> man (if that).

unless of course it was god's will that this clone be jesus again.

i completely agree that cloning does not resurrect anyone. after all, we can clone living people. this also raises the argument of souls. a clone is essentially an identical twin, and people generally don't go around saying one twin has a soul and the other doesn't. (hey -- which is the evil twin -- ida or lisa?). you could argue, however, that the technological hand in creating the clone -- taking a nucleus from a differentiated cell -- might interfere with the en-souling process. i can't speak to that. it's the fodder for science fiction stories. one could also suggest that clones share a unique soul. if this is the case, i think cloning is the only way to save us from the vampires, but that's another whole debate.

furthermore, a clone does differ from being an identical twin in two key ways: gestation in a different mother or at least at a differnt time, and mitochondria. mitochondria are maternally inherited (they are present in the egg, but not the sperm (altho there are rare cases of paternal rescue of maternal mitochondrial disorders). i don't know what is thought about the mary situation -- did she offer a uterus for jesus, or an egg and a uterus? that is, was god a male pronucleus donor, or a whole embryo donor? if jesus came from mary's egg, if we could track down any descendants from the same line, we might be able to find one with similar mitochondria, altho with 2000 yrs of changes. if mary didn't donate the egg, then we face the problem that jesus's mitochondria were divine and we can't really reproduce that.

however, as i mentioned earlier, if this is how jesus is supposed to return, i'm sure god will do whatever it takes with her infinite power to provide the resources and materials we lack. this is another reason why i think choosing nuclei from the miracle of the wine and wafer being jesus's blood and body is the best method b/c it is already requiring one miracle.

>
> Tired of waiting for the second coming? Be glad God is that patient! I can't
> imagine that any of us in the light of truth is so righteous as to be eager
> to be judged!
>
> Elena

maybe it's not an eagerness to be judged but an eagerness to do god's will. if god wills jesus to return now thru the miracle of cloning, who are you (or anyone else) to argue?

once again, i hope i haven't offended anyone. i was the kid in sunday school who asked about jesus going to the bathroom, and asked if it wasn't possible that the chariot of fire were really a rocket ship. i tend to look at religious texts in a way to incorporate what i know in order to reconcile what i find believable with what i don't before resorting to miracles to explain things away in order to find a common ground for discussion.

- cath3ie, who thinks maybe we should try and clone washington, adams, and jefferson and then maybe they could grow up, and these clones could run against each other for president, or even better, we could clone ben franklin and he could run for president since this time we could ensure he'd be american-born