RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: ejheath@batnet.com (Erica Heath) (ejheath@batnet.com (Erica Heath) [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-DEC-1999 15:11:43.00

SUBJECT: Re: Local IRB Approval vs. Central IRB approval

TO: mcwirb@mcwirb.org (mcwirb@mcwirb.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Jeff
What do the Palmetto rules say???

If a doc in the community gives a patient a drug and the patient lands in the hospital, what do you do?

If a doc in the community give a patient a drug (that is investigational) and the patient/subject lands in the hospital, what do you do?

Is there a difference between that and stem cell therapy - at least situationally?

Now--- my question. If the PI considers it treatment and doesn't want to have approval from you, what is the rationale for having review from a central IRB. That tells me that someone along the line still considers what he is doing to be investigational.

Erica - at a central IRB. If we are involved, feel free to call me.

>Situation: An investigator involved in stem cell therapy has in the past
>submitted his nationally sponsored oncology protocols to our hospital for IRB
>review. Now that the PI considers stem cell therapy to be a successful
>outpatient treatment, he questions if he still needs to submit for IRB review
>at our institution since his patients normally do not require hospitalization
>except for in rare circumstances. The trials in which he participates in have
>already been reviewed by a central IRB.
>
>Possible Scenario: A patient on one of his protocols is hospitalized at our
>institution due to an adverse event related to the protocol therapy.
>
>Question #1: Is the information obtained from the hospitalized patient
>reportable to the sponsor for research purposes when there is no IRB approval
>for the protocol at this institution.

>
>Question #2: Should the PI continue to submit protocols to the IRB at our
>institution in case of an unexpected adverse event which would require
>hospitalization?
>
>Question #3: Would information obtained from this patient be reportable
to the
>sponsor if it is to be used for treatment purposes?
>
>Question #4: What if this patient required administration of an
investigational
>agent (part of the protocol therapy) is the information reportable to the
>sponsor for research purposes when there is no IRB approval for the
protocol at
>this institution?
>
>I have my opinions, what are yours?
>
>Jeff Parks
>Palmetto Richland Memorial Hospital
>Research Administration
>5 Med Park
>Columbia, South Carolina 29203
>803/434/4899
>jeff.parks@rmh.edu
>
>
>_____
>MCWIRB maillist - MCWIRB@mcwirb.org
>http://www.mcwirb.org/mailman/listinfo.cgi/mcwirb

Erica Heath
IRC - Independent Review Consulting
P. O. Box 170
San Anselmo, CA 94979-0170
ejheath@batnet.com
voice 415-485-0717
FAX 415-485-0328
www.irb-irc.com

_____
MCWIRB maillist - MCWIRB@mcwirb.org
http://www.mcwirb.org/mailman/listinfo.cgi/mcwirb

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-DEC-1999 15:51:50.00

SUBJECT: FW: Washington Fax December 2, 1999

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

TEXT:
You already know about the NIH stem cell guidelines being posted for public comment. Here is the Washington Fax story.

-----Original Message-----
From: Washington Fax [SMTP:bruce@washington-fax.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 02, 1999 2:50 AM
To: fax@washington-fax.com
Subject: Washington Fax December 2, 1999

****
WASHINGTON FAX
A news and information service from F-D-C Reports, Inc.
****
December 2, 1999

Today's Washington Fax online is available at:
http://www.washingtonfax.com/p1/index.html

Our back issues and supporting documents can be searched from:
http://www.washingtonfax.com/p1/frarchive.html

****

To go to today's top story on the Washington Fax Web site click on this address or copy and paste it to your web browser--or stay right here and read it below:

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH RELEASES STEM CELL RESEARCH GUIDELINES OPPONENTS MAINTAIN CLAIM THE AGENCY IS AFOUL OF EMBRYO RESEARCH BAN

http://www.washingtonfax.com/p1/1999/19991202.html

****

NIH SHOULD TRACK COMMERCIAL SUCCESS OF ITS SBIR PROGRAM, SAYS HHS INSPECTOR GENERAL

http://www.washingtonfax.com/p1/1999/19991202a.html

****

NIH OFFICE OF RECOMBINANT DNA ACTIVITIES GAINS BROADER ROLE, NEW NAME

http://www.washingtonfax.com/p1/1999/19991202b.html

****

NEW $11 MILLION HIV/AIDS PREVENTION AND CARE PROGRAM AIMED AT POVERTY STRICKEN AREAS ON U.S.-MEXICO BORDER

http://www.washingtonfax.com/p1/1999/19991202c.html

****

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH RELEASES STEM CELL RESEARCH GUIDELINES OPPONENTS MAINTAIN CLAIM THE AGENCY IS AFOUL OF EMBRYO RESEARCH BAN

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) moved one step closer Wednesday to funding research with human embryonic stem cells by releasing proposed guidelines that would, among other things, require documentation that cells used by grantees are derived from donated embryos originally created for infertility treatments.

The guidelines, to be published today in the Federal Register, will be subject to a 60-day comment period, after which NIH could either submit a revised version for further review or issue them in final form and begin funding stem cell research. Overall, NIH is looking for a way to support work thought to have enormous therapeutic potential and to do so without violating a law that forbids the federal government from funding research that involves the destruction of human embryos.

A coalition of patient groups welcomed the guidelines as hastening the development of stem-cell related treatments. Opponents of the NIH action said the guidelines are further proof that NIH is running afoul of the ban on embryo research funding.

The isolation last year of so-called "human pluripotent stem cells" has generated considerable excitement in the scientific and patient advocacy community due to the potential of the cells to become almost any cell in the human body. Some scientists believe stem cell research could lead to breakthrough transplant therapies for such chronic afflictions as Parkinson's disease and diabetes, while providing dramatic insights into human development and providing a safe way to screen new drugs.

But NIH's move to fund stem cell research has angered proponents of the embryo research ban. They claim support for stem cell experiments would violate both the spirit and the letter of the law, arguing that there is no legal or ethical separation between the use and extraction of embryonic stem cells.

NIH officials have tried to calm the controversy by promising that any agency-supported stem cell research would be "conducted in an ethical and legal manner." They also have noted that federal funding would bring with

it a level of oversight that will not be present if the work remains the sole province of the private sector. NIH said yesterday that it would establish a special Human Pluripotent Stem Cell Review Group to assure compliance with the research guidelines.

"While the potential medical benefits of human stem cell technology are compelling and worthy of pursuit, the NIH believes that this area of research should be supported in accordance with strict ethical standards," asserts an agency statement that accompanied the release of the guidelines. "NIH understands and respects the ethical, legal and social issues relevant to human pluripotent stem cell research and is sensitive to the need to subject it to oversight more stringent than that associated with the traditional NIH scientific peer review process."

The NIH initiative is reliant on a legal opinion from the Department of Health and Human Services that concludes stem cells are not covered by the embryo research funding ban since they are not embryos. Thus, NIH has submitted guidelines that would allow the agency to support experiments with the cells themselves while simultaneously stating that the "derivation of pluripotent stems cells from early human embryos" is "ineligible" for funding. In other words, NIH believes use is allowed, even if derivation is not.

However, the guidelines would require an investigator to play a role in the extraction work by documenting that the derivation process meets certain standards. For example, researchers would have to certify that the source embryos originally were created for an infertility treatment and were "frozen and in excess of clinical need."

They also would have to provide NIH with "the protocol, including the informed consent document used" in the derivation process, proof that it was approved by an Institutional Review Board, and "an assurance" that the stem cells, once isolated, are either donated or that any payment does not exceed the cost of the "transportation, processing, preservation, quality control and storage of the stem cells."

The guidelines do not appear to prevent an investigator from using private funds to extract stem cells from embryos and then use public money to work with the cells themselves. They state only that, in terms of obtaining the embryos, there must be an arms-length relationship. The guidelines stipulate that "the fertility treatment and the researcher or investigator deriving and/or proposing to utilize human pluripotent stem cells should not have been one and the same person."

Richard Doerflinger, with the National Conference of Catholic Bishops' Committee on Pro-Life Activities, said the detailed instructions on how embryos are to be obtained actually move NIH closer to supporting embryo research.

"NIH is saying we won't involve the federal government in human embryo research but we will give detailed instructions on how to obtain and destroy embryos in order to get the federal reward of grant money," Doerflinger said in an interview. "This involves the government very deeply in regulating the donation and destruction of human embryos."

However, Dan Perry, the head of the Patients' Coalition for Urgent Research, an umbrella group of patient advocates supportive of stem cell research, said the guidelines would allow "important research to go forward in a way that meets the public's demand for ethically conducted science."

"They will set up an important framework for monitoring science which is brand new and deserving of scrutiny," he said in a prepared statement.

A congressional staffer who works with lawmakers opposed to the NIH initiative said the publication of the proposed guidelines "gives us more of an impetus to look at what our alternatives are" in terms of taking action to block their implementation. This aide noted that lawmakers are likely to consider some sort of legislative strategy, though that option has been limited somewhat by the fact that the FY 2000 appropriations process--which provides numerous vehicles for such actions--was wrapped up last week.

Doerflinger believes that a court challenge would be difficult, given that it would be hard to find an individual or a group that would have the legal standing to bring a case.

On the other side of the issue, Sen. Arlen Specter, R-PA, has received assurances from the Senate leadership that he will get a vote next year on legislation that would allow NIH to fund both use and derivation of embryonic stem cells. Specter has said he would follow the recommendation of the National Bioethics Advisory Commission (NBAC), which earlier this year concluded that the potential medical benefits of stem cell research warrant federal funding for both use and derivation.

In addition to addressing embryonic stem cells, the proposed NIH guidelines also set standards for the use of stem cells derived from aborted fetuses. However, this area has been less controversial, since fetal tissue research already is eligible for federal funding.

Scientists have said that to realize the medical potential of pluripotent stem cells, research must be done with both fetal and embryonic stem cells. While the cells appear to be similar, researchers say that upon further study significant differences could emerge.

--Matthew Davis

"Draft National Institutes of Health Guidelines for Research Involving Human Pluripotent Stem Cells" are available on the Web at:

http://www.nih.gov/news/stemcell/draftguidelines.htm

Compiled by Washington Fax: an Information Service of F-D-C Reports, Inc.
Managing Editor: Shirley Haley
Phone: 508.999.6097 Fax: 508.994.9366
E-mail: subscriptions@washington-fax.com

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Gregory Aharonian <srctran@world.std.com> (Gregory Aharonian <srctran@world.std.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-DEC-1999 17:35:59.00

SUBJECT: PATNEWS: Support Call for stem cell research; AAAS evolution statement

TO: patent-news@world.std.com (patent-news@world.std.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
!19991217 Support Call for stem cell research; AAAS evolution statement

A call for action to support stem cell research from the American Society of Cell Biology can be found at http://www.jscpp.org/jscpp/Stemcell.htm, for which the text (without links) follows.

==========

Stem Cell Issue

I. Action needed

Please contact your Senators and Representatives and urge them to support stem cell research and oppose legislation to ban such research. If you would like assistance please contact [mailto:tleshan@ascb.org] Tim Leshan at the [http://www.ascb.org/ascb] ASCB.

For information on how to contact your Senators and your Representative see <http://www.jscpp.org/jscpp/congress.htm>.

II. Background

Scientific and patient groups have joined forces to try to prevent a ban of stem cell research. Both Senate Labor Health & Human Service Appropriations Chairman Arlen Specter (R-PA) and House Chairman John Porter (R-IL) as well as ranking Democrats Senator Tom Harkin (D-IA) and David Obey (D-WI), have opposed a ban on stem cell research. Recently Rep. Brian Bilbray (R-CA) and Senator Strom Thurmond (R-SC) also announced their support for this research. Despite this level of support, a vote on this issue could be extremely close.

With the passage of the final FY'2000 funding package on November 18 & 19 there was no indication of any language regarding stem cell research. In other words no ban on federal funding of stem cell research was passed by Congress in 1999. This issues promises to come back up next year, but for the time being there is no restriction on federal funding for research on stem cell lines.

Hearing

On November 4, the Senator Labor HHS Appropriations Subcommittee held its

forth stem cell hearing. The witnesses included Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-SC), Rep. Jay Dickey (R-AR), Frank Young, Former FDA Commissioner, and Jack Childress of UVA and NBAC.

Senator Specter was the only member of the Subcommittee to attended the hearing. He opened the hearing with brief remarks where he brought everyone up to date with regard to the issue and reiterated that Senator Lott had said the Senate would consider a stand alone stem cell bill in February.

The first witness was Frank Young former FDA Commissioner who is now a minister at Four Presbyterian Church in Bethesda. Young expressed his opposition to embryonic stem cell research and explained that as a former FDA commissioner he was in an unusual position in doing so. He talked about how he had directed the FDA's effort with regard to recombinant DNA research, but he thinks stem cell research is much different because it "destroys life". He expressed the view that adult cells would be sufficient and he proposed that a new commission be formed to study the issue of stem cell research. He also called for a three-year moratorium on embryonic stem cell research.

Rep. Dickey testified next, and did not provide new information. He acknowledged that he and Specter have disagreed on issues in the past, but joked that he always loses those disagreements. Dickey feels the issue "is science serving man or is man serving science" and if it is the later he is opposed. Dickey equated stem cell research to Nazi German experiments on people and the Tuskegee syphilis experiments. He argued that we should not spend tax dollars on science that some taxpayers oppose. When Specter brought
up fetal tissue research, Dickey admitted that allowing this research to go forward probably had not caused more abortions to be performed, but he still
opposed it. He did say that since fetal tissue research is legal, that scientists should just focus on that type of stem cell research. Dickey also said that while he opposed the private sector doing embryonic stem cell research that he could leave latitude for it to proceed in the private sector. Specter then made the point that the stem cell lines would be derived by the private sector not federally funded scientists. Dickey ended by saying that he was arguing from the heart while Specter and others were arguing from the mind. The discussion between Specter and Dickey was very cordial, but clearly neither convinced the other of their view.

James Childress of the NBAC and UVA did a good job of describing the process
the NBAC went through in drafting its report and the recommendations they came up with. He is not a scientist, but he made good points about how scientists who had testified before NBAC believed it was important to proceed with embryonic stem cell research.

Senator Strom Thurmond expressed his strong support for stem cell research and NIH funding of that research. Senator Specter said how important it had been to get Senator Thurmond's support on fetal tissue research and he thought the same would be true with stem cell research.

Specter ended the hearing with no conclusionary remarks. This hearing is not
likely to have much bearing this year's stem cell debate. Specter did say there will be more hearings.

Appropriations

Rep. Jay Dickey (R-AR) had planned to offer an amendment to ban stem cell research on the House Labor HHS Appropriations bill, but he chose not to. Apparently he was asked not to offer it by the Congressional leadership in order to keep the Labor HHS bill moving forward. He has said that if the President vetoes the bill and the House reconsiders it he would then like to
offer his amendment, but that is not likely to occur. In the Senate, Senator
Specter included language in his version of the Labor HHS bill that would "carve out an exception to the human embryo ban to permit Federal researchers to derive human embryonic stem cells from embryos obtained from in vitro fertilization clinics," but he was asked by Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-MS) to strike the language when it bill came before the full Appropriations Committee. This language remains out of the bill as it is being considered on the floor of the Senate. It is not clear yet what will happen next with regard to Congressional action on stem cell research, but we will be watching it closely.

In September the National Bioethics Advisory Commission ([http://bioethics.gov/nbac.html] NBAC) released its final report on stem cell research. The NIH should release its guidelines on federally funded stem cell research soon.

The Congressional Biomedical Research Caucus held a briefing on the [http://www.jscpp.org/jscpp/Cauc91599.htm] The Potential of Stem Cell Research on September 15, featuring Dr. John Gearhart of the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine.

On July 29, 126 patient groups and scientific and medical organizations sent a [http://www.aamc.org/advocacy/corres/research/stmcell2.htm] letter to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees supporting federal funding of research using human pluripotent stem cells.

For further information regarding the science of adult and ES cells click [http://sdb.bio.purdue.edu/SDBNews/focus/stem_cell_899.html] here.

The NBAC met on July 14 to discuss its stem cell report to the President. Although the report was not final, the NBAC did agree on and release its recommendations, which include a call for the federal government to not only support the funding of research on stem cell lines but also the derivation of stem cells from embryos. This would require a partial lifting of the stem cell ban. The White House immediately released a statement on the Commission's recommendations; the statement appears to protect the potential for research while holding opponents at bay: "the Clinton Administration recognizes that human stem cell technology's potential medical benefits are compelling and worthy of pursuit, so long as the research is conducted according to the highest ethical standards. NIH is

putting in place guidelines and an oversight system that will ensure that the cells are obtained in an ethically sound manner. The President's 1994 ban on the use of Federal funds for the creation of human embryos for research purposes will remain in effect. No other legal actions are necessary at this time, because it appears that human embryonic stem cells will be available from the private sector. Publicly funded research using these cells is permissible under the current Congressional ban on human embryo research." This statement makes it clear that the Clinton Administration will only support the use of stem cell lines and not the derivation of those cells. The National Institutes of Health has not released its guidelines for federally-funded researchers who wish to use embryonic stem cells.

Patients' CURe a group of organizations advocating on behalf of stem cell research held a stem cell briefing on Capitol Hill, July 7th. This event will featured a diabetes and Parkinson's patient, as well as a scientist and an ethicist. The scientists discussed each type of stem cells including, embryonic, fetal and "adult." Some 70 Congressional staff were in attendance.

On July 1, Senator Sam Brownback (R-KS) held a press conference in the Capitol to express his opposition to embryonic stem cell research. He released a statement opposing embryonic stem cell research, signed by several people supportive of the pro-life view including lawyers, scientists and ethicists. The statement focuses on their contention that research on embryonic stem cells is not needed due to the work being done on "adult" cells. When asked what he planned to do legislatively on the stem cell issue Brownback said "we are looking at our options". He elaborated by saying there are several options: Appropriations, hearings, attaching something to another bill, or a legal option. He ended by saying that the law is plain, but some want to explain it further. He also made it clear that he was not pursuing the lawsuit option himself.

On June 28 the NBAC met to discuss their [http://bioethics.gov/briefings/index.html#draft] draft stem cell report. We had thought they might finish their report at this meeting, but the report won't be finalized until their July 13-14 meeting in Cambridge, MA, and released shortly there after. As you may have seen NBAC went back to the
discussion of federal support for "use" and "derivation" of stem cells. There are at least three members of the panel who seem uncomfortable with federal support of the derivation of stem cells. Harold Shapiro, Chair of the NBAC, seems to want to stick with the general point in the earlier draft that NBAC would support federal funding for both use and derivation. The NBAC is clearly going to come out in support of embryonic stem cell research, its just not clear how deep their support will be. The NIH is also due to release the final guidelines for stem cell research in the next few weeks.

The NBAC draft received a great deal of media attention because it calls for the limited lifting of the ban on embryo research in order to allow for stem cell research. The ban, which is found in the Labor/HHS appropriations bill, restricts all federal funding for research "in which a human embryo or embryos are destroyed, discarded or knowingly subjected

to risk of injury or death greater than that allowed for research on fetuses in utero . . . " Earlier this year the Department of Health and Human Services ruled that federal funds could be used for stem cell research so long as the funds were not used to derive the cells from embryos. The draft NBAC report calls into question the HHS ruling saying "it is NBAC's view that there is no compelling ethical justification for distinguishing between the derivation and use of human stem cells." The NBAC draft report has also caused some consternation on Capitol Hill with those who oppose stem cell research that involved embryos. Tom Bliley(R-VA) Chairman of the House Commerce Committee that oversees the NIH has said he will hold hearings regarding the draft report which has "gravely disappointed" him.

Around the same time that the NBAC draft report was released a new group called the Patients' Coalition for Urgent Research or Patients' CURe held a press conference on Capitol Hill to announce the formation of a group of patient advocates in favor of stem cell research. The group of almost 30 organizations including the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation International, the Parkinson's Action Network and the Paralyzed Veterans of America also released polling data showing that "74% of those polled favor funding for stem cell research by the NIH."

The NIH will also release the final draft of its stem cell guidelines in the next month, which may lead to a lawsuit in an effort to block their implementation. At the recent NIH Director's Advisory Committee meeting Harold Varmus reiterated his intention to publish the draft guidelines in the federal register for 60 days of public comment. Following the comment period and depending on the comments the guidelines will be adopted by the NIH. Varmus envisions allowing some current grantees to obtain stem cells from a private vendor in order to begin to study them.

On Tuesday, April 27 at Noon, Paul Berg, Ph.D., Cahill Professor in Cancer Research, Department of Biochemistry and Director of the Beckman Center for Molecular and Genetic Medicine at Stanford University School of Medicine gave a [http://www.ascb.org/ascb/pubpol/stembrief.htm] briefing on stem cell research to Congressional staff. Both sides of the issue were represented and Dr. Berg did an excellent job of responding to questions. The following day [http://www.ascb.org/ascb/news/vol22no6/policy.htm#BERG] Dr. Berg testified before the House Labor/HHS Appropriations subcommittee on this and other topics.

At the Labor-HHS Hearing on April 15 Rep. Duke Cunningham [R-CA] announced publicly that he will support health research using pluripotent stem cells. He cited the long and arduous process he went through with the issue, the benefits and promise of the research, and noted that the decision may not necessarily be popular in his district.

On April 14th at the National Health Council breakfast Rep. John Porter(R-IL)
responded to a question about what he thought would happen with the stem cell issue. Porter said he does not want this issue to take away from the more important issue of funding for biomedical research. He expects and amendment on the Labor-HHS bill on this issue, but he is optimistic that even if it passes there that it won't in the Senate. Porter will support

the NIH effort to fund stem cell research.

On April 8, 1999 the Working Group of the Advisory Committee to the NIH Director meet in public session to develop guidelines for research involving
human pluripotent stem cells.

NIH Director, Harold Varmus opened the meeting with a brief history of the stem cell issue starting with their discovery in the 50s to the recent political debate. His goal for the meeting was to have the Committee draft guidelines, which will then be published in the federal register and eventually be present to him and the full Directors Advisory Committee for approval.
Shirley Tilghman of Princeton and Ezra Davidson of Charles Drew University of Medicine and Science in LA co-chaired the Committee. Brigid Hogan of Vanderbilt who is also on the committee was asked to give an opening primer on the science of stem cells for the group. She did a nice job of explaining why it was necessary to study pluripotent stem cells. A period of public comment followed where three groups, ASCB, SDB and the Aging Alliance spoke in favor of stem cell research and the guidelines process and two groups, the Conference of Catholic Bishops and the U.S. House Prolife Caucus spoke against. The main focus of those opposed was on the HHS ruling that allows federal funding for research on pluripotent stem cell lines which they view as fundamentally flawed. Eric Meslin of NBAC reviewed the work they had been doing on the issue. NBAC hopes to have a draft of their report by May and possibly a final report in June.

The discussion then turned to the draft guidelines which the committee had been working on via email prior to the meeting. The draft guidelines focus on the definition of pluripotent stem cells, the derivation of the cells, informed consent, ineligible research using these cells, and the review and oversight of the protocols that will be submitted to NIH. The guidelines outline a process the provider of the stem cells must follow so the cells can be used use by federally funded scientists.

In the late afternoon the Committee discussed review and oversight of the protocols which is not spelled out in the draft. Wendy Baldwin of NIH put forth some possible scenarios for this process; one for new grants and another for existing grants. Grants would first have to go through the IRB process on the local level. When new grants are submitted to the NIH they would go though scientific review first, then the individual NIH institute would review it, then the stem cell committee, then it would go back to the institute for final approval. There are several things that need to occur along this process, but these would be the steps an application for stem cell research would follow. The Committee liked this approach and will spell it out in the next draft.

The Committee was a good group of thoughtful diverse representatives who have developed draft guidelines that will work. It will be important to study the review and oversight section of the guidelines once they have been written. Finally, it could take until the fall before the final guidelines are developed.

On [http://www.ascb.org/ascb/pubpol/stemcellltr.htm] March 4, JSC member

Paul Berg along with 32 other Nobel Laureates, including J. Michael Bishop, wrote to Congress and the President expressing support for federal funding of stem cell research. The letter warns that not allowing federal funding for stem cell research will preclude potentially critical research. It was warmly received by House and Senate Members who support allowing federal support for stem cell research.

The Nobel letter was released following a volley of debate on Capitol Hill. On Feb. 11, 72 House Members sent a letter to HHS Secretary Donna Shalala opposing stem research and the recent HHS legal ruling allowing such research to go forward. Seven Senators sent a similar letter. In response, the Secretary, in a letter to Rep. Jay Dickey (R-AR), reaffirmed the Administration's defense of allowing federal funds to be applied to stem cell research.

House Members who had opposed federal funding of stem cell research had considered proposing an amendment to the FY'99 Supplemental Appropriations bill to ban such research. Ultimately the amendment was not introduced, presumably because its supporters it would not gain enough support for passage.

During the Labor/HHS Appropriations hearings in both Houses, the stem cell issue emerged repeatedly. Calling the stem cell research issue a "real battleground," Senator Specter reported that he intends to schedule a fourth hearing, focusing on opposition to the Department's ruling. Specter suggested that it may be prudent to modify the law needs to explicitly allow for work on derivative stem cells. To address the concerns of Members who wish to modify the current ban on embryo research, Secretary Shalala defended the current ban, indicating that it is rigorously enforced to prevent federally-funded embryo research while permitting federally-funded derivative stem cell research. She stressed the extraordinary promise of stem cell research and reassured Congress that it would not be implemented until guidelines are established by the NIH. "We believe we are within the law," Shalala said. Specter asked each NIH institute director to provide him with a written statement of the potential value of stem cell research. He said it would be helpful for proponents of stem cell research to be "armed with specifics from the experts."

Senator Jon Kyl (R-AZ), one of the seven Senators on record opposing the HHS ruling to allow stem cell research, responded by warning that he would submit questions about stem cell research to NIH Director Harold Varmus. Conspicuously absent from the hearing was Rep. Dickey, a vocal opponent of stem cell research.

Ranking Minority Member Rep. David Obey (D-WI) raised concerns about the source of such cells and cautioned Varmus that his interpretation of the law differs from the Administration's finding that the federal ban on funding research with human embryos extends to work with stem cells derived from them. He challenged the NIH to demonstrate "why it is crucial for this research to go ahead" and must "take seriously that a lot of people who are concerned about this are operating in good faith."

On January 12, Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA), Chairman of the Labor, Health & Human Services and Education Appropriations Subcommittee, held

the second hearing in two months on stem cell research.
[http://www.ascb.org/ascb/pubpol/stemcelltest.htm] Congressional Liaison Committee member, Larry Goldstein, of the University of California, San Diego
and the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, testified on behalf of the ASCB. The
hearing examined the current ban on embryo research for those who receive federal research funding. The ban is considered to extend to research on stem cells derived from human embryos. In this hearing, Senators Specter and Thomas Harkin (D-IA), ranking Democrat on the Committee, considered patent aspects of stem cell research and the potential of this research to impact specific diseases such as juvenile diabetes and Parkinson's.

Senator Specter opened the hearing by expressing his disappointment that other scientific societies had not developed a position on stem cell research. He went on to express his anger with the Geron Corporation, that holds the patent on the recent stem cell research performed by John Gearhart at Johns Hopkins, for declining to accept his invitation to testify. Specter also declared that his "hope is to move legislation to lift the ban on embryo research" to allow for work on stem cells by federally funded researchers.

Maria Freire, technology transfer officer for the NIH testified on how intellectual property interests can inhibit science, noting how, while Bayh/Dole act had been used effectively in the development of biotechnology companies, it may not allow for sufficient sharing of research tools by the academic community.

Goldstein registered the ASCB's support for the Chairman and Ranking Member's intent to lift the embryo research ban, especially for stem cell research. He defined distinguished pluripotent and totipotent cells and underscored the cost of continued inhibitation of scientific progress. Doug Melton, Chairman of Harvard's Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology testified as a scientist and a patient-father, on behalf of the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation.

Specter urged the science advocacy community to engage the debate, and to take special pains to distinguish the safety and potential benefits of stem cell research.

Several days later, on January 19 NIH Director Harold Varmus announced to the National Bioethics Advisory Commission that the Department of Health & Human Services had ruled that those scientists using federal funds could work on derivative human stems cells so long as they did not come directly from an embryo. An NIH review panel will be created to approve those research projects requesting to work in this area, on the model of the Recombinant DNA Advisory Committee (RAC).

The Senate Labor, Health & Human Services and Education Appropriations Subcommittee held its third hearing on stem cells on January 26. Senator Specter said that he was going to hold of introducing stem cell legislation for the time being. Dr. Varmus explained that the NIH will now begin to form
guidelines and procedures to oversee stem cell research. He will convene a

subcommittee of his Advisory Committee to develop these guidelines. They will consider information from the Embryo Research Panel, the fetal tissue debate and NBAC. They hope that within the next couple of months the guidelines will be written. The guidelines will then be published in the Federal Register for public comment following which they will be released and the NIH could begin to fund this research.

On February 11, over 70 members of the House sent a letter to Health and Human Services (HHS) Secretary Donna Shalala, disputing the ruling which would allow the NIH to go forward with stem cell research. The Members included Majority Leader Dick Armey (R-TX) and Majority Whip Tom DeLay (R-TX), Jay Dickey (R-AR) and eight Democrats. A few days later seven Senators sent a similar letter. Secretary Shalala responded to these letters on February 23 in a letter that did not back down from the original ruling. Senator Specter is planing another hearing to discuss these letters.

Several scientific and patient groups have been meeting to discuss this situation and working with key Members of both parties to ensure that stem cell research is not band similar to embryo research.

For further information or assistance, contact Tim Leshan at [mailto:tleshan@ascb.org] tleshan@ascb.org.

Last updated November 22, 1999

==========

AAAS Statement on the Kansas State Board of Education Decision on the Education of Students in the Science of Evolution and Cosmology

The American Association for the Advancement of Science deplores the recent decision by the Kansas State Board of Education to remove references to evolution and cosmology from its state education standards and assessments, thereby making central principles for the scientific understanding of the universe and its history optional subjects for science education. This decision by the Board is a serious disservice to students and teachers in the State of Kansas. To become informed and responsible citizens in our increasingly technological world, students need to study and judge for themselves the empirical evidence and concepts central to current scientific understanding. The actions of the State Board of Education may place Kansas students at a competitive disadvantage in their education and work environments. By discouraging teachers from using the best available professional knowledge about the nature and history of the universe, the Board's decision will make it more difficult for Kansas to recruit capable and inspiring science teachers.

Recognizing that the State Board of Education decision is a serious setback for public education in the State of Kansas, the AAAS adopts the following resolution:

Whereas, it has never been more important for American citizens to

achieve a basic understanding of contemporary science and technology; and

Whereas, the concepts and evidence inextricably linked to our understanding of the nature and history of the universe are fundamental to the basic education of all Americans; and

Whereas, learning succeeds best when teachers and students can explore, investigate, and criticize the fundamental concepts and ideas in science; and

Whereas, learning and inquiry are severely inhibited if teachers are placed in a position where they may feel pressured to alter their teaching of the fundamental concepts of science in response to demands external to the scientific disciplines,

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the AAAS urges the citizens of Kansas to restore the topics of evolution and cosmology to the state curriculum. AAAS stands ready to assist all concerned citizens of Kansas in securing the repeal of this damaging ruling by the State Board of Education.

Therefore Be It Further Resolved, that the AAAS and others committed to educational excellence in science work aggressively to oppose measures that could adversely affect the teaching of science, wherever they may occur.

Therefore Be It Further Resolved, that the AAAS encourages its affiliated societies to endorse this resolution and to communicate their support to the citizens and appropriate public officials in Kansas.

Adopted by the AAAS Board of Directors
October 15, 1999

==========

Greg Aharonian
Internet Patent News Service

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 09:34:26.00

SUBJECT: FW: Draft NIH guidelines

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

TEXT:
You may find the following of interest--these are John Fletcher's comments
on
the NIH stem cell guidelines.

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: DR. John Fletcher [SMTP:jcf4x@virginia.edu]
Sent: Thursday, January 06, 2000 12:16 PM
To: Meslin, Eric (OD)
Subject: RE: Draft NIH guidelines

Please do, and thank you.

At 09:09 AM 1/3/00 -0500, you wrote:
>John--
>
>Thanks very much for sending these. Any objections to my sharing them
with NBAC
>commissioners and staff?
>
>Eric
>
>
>p.s. and a very happy new year 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
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: DR. John Fletcher [SMTP:jcf4x@virginia.edu]
> Sent: Saturday, January 01, 2000 3:43 PM
> To: Stemcell
> Cc: Skirboll, Lana (OD); Meslin, Eric (OD);
>roberta@womens-health.org
> Subject: Draft NIH guidelines
>
> COMMENTS ON DRAFT NIH GUIDELINES FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN
>PLURIPOTENT
> STEM CELLS (DEC 1999)
>
> In my opinion, the proposed NIH guidelines are constructed on the
right
> moral and legal premises, i.e., it is neither offensive to
morality nor
> illegal to expend public funds on research using pluripotent stem
cells
> (PSCs) that have been derived with support of private funds.
Further,
>the
> guidelines require the prospective grantee or contractor to show
that
>the
> PSCs were derived only from donated frozen embryos in excess of
clinical
> needs for infertility treatment by couples who were adequately
informed
> about the research uses of their unwanted embryos.
>
> As public policy, the guidelines are a moral compromise that shows
>respect
> for opposing moral views on embryo research. NIH funding of
research
>uses
> of PSCs derived from embryos causes moral suffering to those who
view
>the
> preimplantation human embryo with respect due a living person,
since the
> embryos that are sources of these PSCs will have been willfully
>destroyed.
> However, existing federal law prevents using public funds for
research
>that
> destroys embryos, even for a beneficial purpose. Thus, the
guidelines
>show

> some respect for moral traditions view embryos as human beings by
>limiting
> NIH funding only to uses of PSCs.
>
> The guidelines are also responsive to the moral views of those who
>strongly
> support biomedical research by affirming that the NIH can fund
research
>uses
> of PSCs derived from embryos. The guidelines cause moral
suffering to
>these
> supporters, due to restriction of NIH funding of derivation of
PSCs from
> embryos. This restriction will predictably delay the rate of
progress
>to
> the desired goal of clinical trials of cell replacement therapy
in human
> beings who suffer from diseases caused by cell injury or cell
death.
> However, the guidelines do support a real effort of combined
private and
> federal support towards this goal, even if it is not the optimal
rate of
> progress. In a genuine moral compromise, each proponent of
opposing
> arguments must give up something valuable.
>
> I have only two specific comments about the guidelines: 1) Why the
>different
> wording on IRB approval of protocols involving fetal tissue as a
source
>of
> PSCs and embryos? On p.7, the wording is "documentation of IRB
>approval, if
> any, of the research protocol; on p. 5, the "if any" does not
appear. I
>do
> not understand the function of the words "if any." IRB approval
should
>be
> documented in either case, should it not? 2) The guidelines
should
>refer
> prospective grantees or contractors to the official report of the
>National
> Bioethics Advisory Commission on human stem cell research. The
NBAC
>report
> will be a valuable resource to researchers and to the public. It
fleshes
>out
> many of the unspoken moral assumptions of the NIH guidelines,

although
>it
> differs significantly on the issue of federal funding of
derivation and
>uses
> of PSCs from embryos. In this respect the NIH guidelines are a
better
> expression of the spirit of compassionate moral compromise needed
to
>move
> federal funding of PSC research forward than are the NBAC's
>recommendations
> that Congress partially amend the ban on federal funding of embryo
>research.
> Nonetheless, the NBAC report is a well-argued and valuable
extended
>moral
> defense of the permissibility of federal funding of PSC
research. The
>NIH
> guidelines lack the necessary larger moral and legal discussion
>responsive
> to moral arguments of opponents of embryo research. The NIH
guidelines
>+
> the NBAC report comprise the most useful set of resources for
IRBs and
> researchers. There is much to be gained by referring IRBs,
researchers,
>and
> the public to the NBAC report.
>
> My congratulations to the Working Group of the ACD and to the
NIH's
>Office
> of Science Policy on this set of guidelines.
>
> ----------
> John C. Fletcher, PhD
> Professor of Biomedical Ethics (emeritus), University of Virginia
School
>of
> Medicine
>
> Home Office
> Phone: (804) 295-1940 Fax (804) 295-0285
> email address: jcf4x@virginia.edu
>
> Mailing address: 1454 Bremerton Lane, Keswick, VA 22947-9145
>
>

John C. Fletcher, PhD

Professor of Biomedical Ethics (emeritus), University of Virginia School of Medicine

Home Office
Phone: (804) 295-1940 Fax (804) 295-0285
email address: jcf4x@virginia.edu

Mailing address: 1454 Bremerton Lane, Keswick, VA 22947-9145

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Simon, Tony (NIDA)" <tjsimon@nida.nih.gov> ("Simon, Tony (NIDA)" <tjsimon@nida.nih.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 08:55:34.00

SUBJECT: FW: 1/12/2000 NIH STEP Presentation

TO: "'sefellows@aaas.org'" <sefellows@aaas.org> ("'sefellows@aaas.org'" <sefellows@aaas.org> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Folks
I thought this may be of interest to many of you. It is likely that if you cannot make the talk you will be able to find it later at the NIH Videocasting site where you can watch past events on RealPlayer (like the roast of Harold Varmus complete with the awful "garage band" The Directors). That site is: http://videocast.nih.gov/
--Tony

-----Original Message-----
From: Austin, Patricia F. [mailto:pa5s@NIH.GOV]
Sent: Thursday, January 06, 2000 11:46 AM
To: List NIH-STAFF
Subject: 1/12/2000 NIH STEP Presentation

SCIENCE FOR ALL - Stem Cells: Nature's Repair Shop

Wednesday, January 12, 2000 (please note the new date)
9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.
Shannon Bldg. (#1), Third Floor - Wilson Hall

The featured speakers are: Dr. Lana Skirboll, NIH Associate Director for Science Policy, and Dr. Eric Meslin, Executive Director of the National Bioethics Advisory Commission.

Imagine if you could make any kind of cell in the body and repair or replace cells damaged from a heart attack or a severe burn or a stroke. Stem cell research may make this medical dream a reality. It's hard to pick up a newspaper today without seeing a headline about stem cells... What are they? Why are they causing so much interest and controversy? Why are scientists excited about them and ethicists concerned? NIH staff attendees at this STEP Science for All will learn the latest developments and the profound biomedical implications of stem cell research as well as the challenging ethical controversies.

This session will be broadcast over the MBONE and can be viewed with such products as IP/TV for Windows 95/NT or Quicktime TV for the Macintosh. For more information contact Ken Wong (KenWong@nih.gov).

Attendance at this session is free and open to NIH employees in all grades and job series. Attendance at STEP activities earns credit toward NIH Grants Management Certification and ESA credit. Seating is on a space available basis. No advanced registration is necessary. Sign language interpretation will be provided.

For further information, please contact the STEP Program Office on (301) 435-2769 or visit http://odoerdb2.od.nih.gov/oer/training/step/step_program_info.htm

==========

Patty Austin
Director, STEP Program Office
OEP/OER/OD/NIH/DHHS
6701 ROCKLEDGE DRIVE, MSC 7911
BETHESDA, MD 20817-7911
phone: 301-435-2769 & fax:301-480-8443
E-mail: pa5s@nih.gov

STEP Web Page Address --
http://odoerdb2.od.nih.gov/oer/training/step/step.htm

OER Training Web Page Address --
http://odoerdb2.od.nih.gov/oer/training/training.htm

==========

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tony Mazzaschi <Tmazzaschi@aamc.org> (Tony Mazzaschi <Tmazzaschi@aamc.org> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 11:54:50.00

SUBJECT: adhoc-gov: NIH Stem Cell Guidelines

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

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

TEXT:
Received: from aamcinfo.aamc.org by wpo.aamc.org; Mon, 10 Jan 2000
11:29:40 -0500
Received: (from majordom@localhost) by aamcinfo.aamc.org (8.8.6
(PHNE_14041)/8.8.6) id LAA24402 for adhoc-outgoing; Mon, 10 Jan 2000
11:29:04 -0500 (EST)
Received: from fw.faseb.org (fw.faseb.org [12.17.12.66]) by
aamcinfo.aamc.org (8.8.6 (PHNE_14041)/8.8.6) with SMTP id LAA24392 for
<adhoc@aamcinfo.aamc.org>; Mon, 10 Jan 2000 11:28:53 -0500 (EST)
Received: from ascb.org (ascb.faseb.org [192.0.2.69]) by fw.faseb.org
(8.9.3/8.9.1) with SMTP id LAA07942 for <adhoc@aamcinfo.aamc.org>; Mon, 10
Jan 2000 11:30:03 -0500 (EST)
Received: from ASCB_DOMAIN-Message_Server by ascb.org with
Novell_GroupWise; Mon, 10 Jan 2000 11:28:25 -0500
Date: Mon, 10 Jan 2000 11:28:08 -0500
From: "Tim Leshan" <TLESHAN@ascb.org>
Subject: Adhoc: NIH Stem Cell Guidelines
Sender: owner-adhoc@aamcinfo.aamc.org
To: <adhoc@aamcinfo.aamc.org>
Reply-to: "Tim Leshan" <TLESHAN@ascb.org>
Message-id: <s879c259.010@ascb.org>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5.2
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-disposition: inline
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Precedence: bulk
Some of you have asked me for a copy of the American Society for Cell
Biology letter to the NIH regarding the Draft NIH Guidelines for
Research Involving Human Pluripotent Stem Cells so I thought it might
be easiest to send it to the Ad Hoc list. I urge each of your
organizations to write to the NIH regarding these guidelines before
the January 31 deadline. Please let me know if you have any questions.
Thanks

Tim

January 6, 2000

NIH Office of Science Policy
1 Center
Drive Building 1, Room 218
Bethesda, MD 20892

To Whom It May Concern:

I write on behalf of the American Society for Cell Biology, which represents about 10,000 basic biomedical researchers across the country and throughout the world, regarding the December 2, 1999 "Draft National Institutes of Health Guidelines for Research Involving Human Pluripotent Stem Cells."

The guidelines are an important first step forward toward enabling federally-funded scientists to conduct research on human stem cell lines, and thus to provide the maximum medical and scientific benefit to the American people. We especially commend the thoughtful balance reflected in the guidelines between issues of science and issues of ethics.

The discovery of embryonic stem (ES) cells is a major scientific breakthrough, the full value of which cannot be underestimated. ES cells have the potential to form any cell type in the human body, but not a human being. A large body of successful work with mouse ES cells suggests that we can learn how to induce these cells to differentiate into many different cell types. Accomplishing that would enable scientists to create new, healthy tissue to replace damaged or dead tissue, for example bone marrow for treatment of cancer and other hematopoietic diseases, pancreatic cells for alleviating diabetes, and neuronal cells for treating Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's and various forms of brain and spinal cord disorders. We believe that the guidelines as proposed will enable this critical research to advance while simultaneously protecting the moral and ethical sensibilities of the American people.

Specific comments are:

1. A critical element of the proposal is that the federal government will oversee the production and uses of ES cells in federally-funded research rather than allowing private organizations exclusive access to and application of this technology. This gives the government more effective control over standards for access to and use of stem cells and allows public debate and input into the appropriate uses of this important scientific opportunity.

2. The ASCB supports the proposal that NIH funds can be used for research on pluripotent stem cells only if they have been derived from early human embryos that were created for the purpose of infertility treatment and were in excess of clinical need.

3. The ASCB supports the requirement that the donation of human embryos be voluntary and not recompensed at the time of donation or after stem cell lines have been generated from them.

4. The ASCB supports the requirement that early human embryos donated for research are "only frozen early embryos" allowing "donors time between the creation of the embryos for infertility treatment and the decision to donate."

5. The ASCB supports the formation of the Human Pluripotent Stem Cell Review Group (HPSCRG) to oversee the guidelines.

6. The ASCB believes it is especially important that the guidelines clearly define the procedures with which scientists must comply in order to conduct this research. It should also specify procedures which permit the guidelines to be amended or modified as experience warrants.

7. The Society is concerned that the proposed guidelines require federally-funded investigators to validate the protocols and conditions which non-federally-funded suppliers used to produce stem cell lines. If this provision is effected, federally-funded scientists would have to rely on unverifiable and potentially unobtainable information from private-sector suppliers about the sources of the embryos, the means used to obtain and store them, and how the stem cells were prepared. This would make it difficult if not impossible for the investigator to meet the requirements specified in the guidelines. A preferable approach would be for a single set of criteria to be established and applied without regard to the federal funding status of the entity providing the cells. We also urge that the guidelines specify that once a particular stem cell line has been established to be in compliance, investigators should not be required to revalidate their origin and status, and that appropriate prior certifications be considered sufficient.

8. Federally-funded scientists should be allowed to work with stem cell lines that have already been developed for the purposes of research prior to the creation of the draft guidelines.

9. The ASCB regards the current version of the stem cell guidelines as a first and prudent step to enable federally-funded biomedical scientists to explore the enormous potential of human ES cell research. It should make clear that if the current restrictions on embryo research are eliminated, it would consider allowing federally-funded scientists to create new stem cell lines from the same restricted embryo sources as are permitted by the present guidelines, a position recommended by the President's National Bioethics Advisory Commission. In those circumstances, federally-funded scientists would also be permitted to generate stem cell lines using somatic cell nuclear transfer, a procedure that the present guidelines prohibit.

Thank you for the development of these important guidelines and for the opportunity to comment on them.

Sincerely,

Paul Berg, Ph.D.
Cahill Professor of Cancer Research
Director of the Beckman Center for
Molecular & Genetic Medicine
Stanford University
Nobel Laureate in Chemistry, 1980
Chair, ASCB Public Policy Committee

****

Tim Leshan
Director of Public Policy
American Society for Cell Biology
tleshan@ascb.org
www.jscpp.org/jscpp
301-530-7153 (p)
301-530-7139 (f)

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jeffrey Bukowski <jbukowski@AGINGRESEARCH.ORG> (Jeffrey Bukowski <jbukowski@AGINGRESEARCH.ORG> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 11:36:26.00

SUBJECT: (none)

TO: "Bukowski, Jeffrey" <jbukowski@AGINGRESEARCH.ORG> ("Bukowski, Jeffrey" <jbukowski@AGINGRESEARCH.ORG> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Note: Some recipients have been dropped due to syntax errors.Please refer to the "$AdditionalHeaders" item for the complete headers.
SPOTLIGHT ON AGING RESEARCH

An Update By The Alliance For Aging Research

******

Much attention is being paid to a recent study by Institute of Medicine (IOM) which showed that medical errors in the U.S. health care system account for nearly 100,000 accidental deaths annually.

But in a sense, the IOM report is old news - and it does not focus on older Americans, one of the most vulnerable and fastest-growing segments of the population.

More than a year before the IOM study, the Alliance for Aging Research highlighted how the misuse of both prescription and over-the-counter drugs contributed to thousands of preventable deaths and injuries every year. "When Medicine Hurts Instead of Helps," an Alliance report, found that in addition to costing lives, misuse annually costs the United States billions.

Because people over age 65 are the greatest consumers of prescription drugs and over-the-counter medications, the Alliance urges health care professionals to become better informed about how strong medications affect their older patients and to pass that information along. In addition, the inadequate training of health care professionals in geriatric pharmacology is a national problem.

"Government health agencies need to take the lead in alerting doctors, nurses, and pharmacists to those medications which are considered dangerous when they are used by older patients," according to Alliance executive director Daniel Perry. "More frail older persons need to be the subjects of studies both before and after a news drug is approved."

******

AN URGENT REQUEST:

Currently, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) seeks comments for its draft guidelines on federal government funding for stem cell research, a new area of science which holds great promise for millions of patients. It is important that the guidlines are approved to ensure the maximum development of this research. The guidelines will spur involvement in the research by the greatest number of scientists. Plus they will bring the new technology under the most comprehensive monitoring possible.

For a look at the guidelines, see www.nih.gov/news/stemcell/draftguidelines.htm

Please comment positively about the NIH draft guidelines on stem cell research as soon as possible. The deadline for submitting comments is Monday, January 31, 2000. Please note that comments need not be long or detailed. Simply writing, "I support the NIH draft guidelines on stem cell research," or something similar would suffice.

Responses can be sent in to NIH by email: stemcell@mail.nih.gov fax: 301/402-0280; regular mail: Stem Cell Guidelines, NIH Office of Science Policy, 1 Center Drive, Building 1, Room 218, Bethesda, MD 20892.

******

To learn more about medication issues and the Alliance for Aging Research, visit the Alliance's Web site, www.agingresearch.org.

At the Alliance's site, you can order "When Medicine Hurts Instead of Helps," and other Alliance publications such as "Independence for Older Americans," a study that casts light on underrecognized and undertreated chronic diseases of aging, and "You're in Charge!:Your Guide to Good Health After Menopause"; subscribe to "Living Longer and Loving It!" - the Alliance's quarterly newsletter; and, learn more about the world of aging research.

Also, visit www.beeson.org to learn about the Beeson Scholars program, an exciting effort to create and support the next generation of doctors and scientists who will change the face of aging in America.

******

FAST FACTS

* 106,000 fatal adverse drug reactions occur annually

* The cost of medication-related problems in all age groups approaches $85 billion annually.

* The vast majority of costs from misuse of medications are related to cases where people are not institutionalized and living in the general

community, as opposed to cases where individuals are hospitalized.

* If adverse drug reactions were classified as a disease, they would be the fifth-leading cause of disease-related death in America.

* Less than three percent of this year's medical school graduates will have taken any courses in geriatric medicine.

To unsubscribe from this list serve, please write to jbukowski@agingresearch.org and write "unsubscribe" in the subject line.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jeffrey Bukowski <jbukowski@AGINGRESEARCH.ORG> (Jeffrey Bukowski <jbukowski@AGINGRESEARCH.ORG> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-JAN-2000 15:04:08.00

SUBJECT: Spotlight on Aging Research Vol. 1, Number 3

TO: jbukowski@agingresearch.org (jbukowski@agingresearch.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Note: Some recipients have been dropped due to syntax errors.Please refer to the "$AdditionalHeaders" item for the complete headers.
SPOTLIGHT ON AGING RESEARCH

An Update By The Alliance For Aging Research

******

A recent issue of "Stem Cell News" reports that as of Friday, January 14, comments on the National Institutes of Health (NIH) draft guidelines for federal funding of stem cell research are totaling 2 to 1 against the guidelines. Of the 3,042 comments that NIH has received, 2,067 (68 percent) have been negative.

Such a story is cause for great concern. Stem cell research promises to be a hot topic politically this congressional session, and a negative response will spell trouble.

Fortunately, over the past three weeks, positive comments have begun to outnumber negative ones. This is because people who care about the future of biomedical research have taken the time to respond, outstripping the organized campaign of opponents.

The deadline for submitting comments is next Monday, January 31st, exactly one week away. If you haven't already, we urge you to send in your positive comments, and to garner as many positive comments as possible from colleagues and others. Responding is easy and fast. Sending "I support the NIH guidelines for federal funding of human pluripotent stem cell research" will suffice.

For a look at the guidelines, see www.nih.gov/news/stemcell/draftguidelines.htm

Responses can be sent to NIH by email: stemcell@mail.nih.gov, by fax: 301/402-0280; or, by regular mail: Stem Cell Guidelines, NIH Office of Science Policy, 1 Center Drive, Building 1, Room 218, Bethesda, MD 20892.

******

BULLETIN:

PBS will air a program at 8 p.m. tomorrow night, January 25, that highlights advances in longevity. The show, "Never Say Die," will focus on research which has promise for significantly extending the human life span. The Alliance for Aging Research's Life Expectancy Calculator is featured on the program's Web site, http://www.pbs.org/saf/. Be sure to check it out!

******

FAST FACTS:

ï¿½ Stem cell research has the potential to cure some 128 Americans of chronic
and fatal diseases such as Alzheimer's, Parkinson's and heart disease.

ï¿½ Cardiovascular diseases, which stem cell therapy could one day cure or prevent, accounted for 41 percent of all deaths in 1996.

ï¿½ Five Boeing 747 jumbo jets crashing every day for a year equals the 563,100 Americans who die each year from cancer - deaths that could be prevented from stem cell research.

ï¿½ Federal funding of stem cell research has received strong backing from the
34 patient organizations that make up Patients Coalition for Urgent Research, as well as favorable editorials from "The Washington Post," "Los Angeles Times," and the Minneapolis "Star Tribune."

******

To learn more about stem cell research and the Alliance for Aging Research, visit the Alliance's Web site, www.agingresearch.org. At the Alliance's site, you can also order "Putting Aging On Hold," an Alliance report demonstrating how preventing, postponing or curing the diseases of aging will save America billions of dollars. In addition, you can order informative health care literature such as "Controlling High Blood Pressure:
A Woman's Guide," which suggests lifestyle changes that women can make to prevent or control high blood pressure, lists questions that patients can ask their doctor, and discusses different options for treatment.

Also, visit www.beeson.org to learn about the Beeson Scholars program, an exciting effort to create and support the next generation of doctors and scientists who will change the face of aging in America.

******

Tell a friend! We encourage you to send this information to friends and
colleagues who might be interested.

To unsubscribe from this list serve, please write to jbukowski@agingresearch.org and write "unsubscribe" in the subject line.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Richard Davis <rdavis@usaid.gov> (Richard Davis <rdavis@usaid.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:26-JAN-2000 14:20:17.00

SUBJECT: Quick call to action on stem cell research guidelines

TO: sefellows@aaas.org (sefellows@aaas.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Fellows:

Research!America, the medical research advocacy organization, forwarded this to me. I thought I would pass it on.

Dear Medical Research Advocates,

As you may know, the NIH recently issued draft guidelines on research involving the use of stem cells and has asked for comments. Of the responses that NIH has received, negative comments outweigh positive comments two to one. It is vitally important that you weigh in on this subject before the comment period ends January 31st.

Below are a few talking points that can be used in drafting your comments, which do not need to be extensive. In fact, you can simply send an e-mail or fax saying that you support the draft guidelines. Send your completed response to stemcell@mail.nih.gov or fax to Stem Cell Guidelines at (301)402-0280.

Public sector funding for biomedical research - what the draft guidelines would permit - is strongly favored by a vast majority of Americans. For example, a May 1999 survey by Opinion Research Corporation, found that three out of four Americans support funding stem cell research through the NIH.

Research already being conducted suggests that stem cells have the potential to speed the day when life-saving therapies are available for tens of millions of patients and their families.

I commend the thoughtful balance reflected in the guidelines between issues of science and issues of ethics.

Please pass this on to fellow colleagues and feel free to call us at (703)739-2577 x17 if you have any questions. In addition, please copy sbeck@researchamerica.org on your correspondence to NIH so we can gauge the response of our advocacy network.

--
Stephanie A. Beck
Assistant Director, 435 Project

Research!America
908 King Street, Suite 400E
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703)739-2577 x17

Regards,
Dick

****

Richard Davis, Ph.D. (Dick Davis)
AAAS Science and Diplomacy Fellow
USAID (US Agency for International Development)
Israeli Programs and MERC, CDR, CAR
Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research
EGAD/DAA/IP
Room 2-11-104, Ronald Reagan Building
1300 Pennsylavania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20523-2110
rdavis@usaid.gov (Alt. e-mail: rdavis@murray.fordham.edu)
202-712-1135
202- 216-3025 (fax)

****

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: David Bowen <dcbowendc@earthlink.net> (David Bowen <dcbowendc@earthlink.net> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:26-JAN-2000 19:49:14.00

SUBJECT: Re: Quick call to action on stem cell research guidelines

TO: Richard Davis <rdavis@usaid.gov> (Richard Davis <rdavis@usaid.gov> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: sefellows@aaas.org (sefellows@aaas.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Just to add my $0.02....

I think Richard is performing a really valuable service by drawing people's attention to this important issue for biomedical research. FYI (and this is not to discourage a speedy response), I am told that NIH will be extending its deadline for comments since the interest level on this issue is so high. So, if you don't get around to writing your comments this week, don't give up! They will still be accepted for a little while longer.

This issue is likely to get extensive play at least in the Senate this session, so stay tuned.

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:31-JAN-2000 11:47:54.00

SUBJECT: Stem Cell Science Court at Dartmouth

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

TEXT:
Commissioners et al,

On Saturday, January 29, 2000, I participated as panelist at Dartmouth College's "Student Science Court: The Future of Stem Cells". This event was coordinated by Ronald Green, Ph.D, Director of the Ethics Institute at Dartmouth, (who also was a member of the NIH Human Embryo Research Panel). The Science Court brought together presenters (see list below) to discuss the science, ethics, law, and public policy issues involved in stem cell research. The Court was attended by more than 250 undergraduate, graduate, medical and science students. Other members of the public were in attendance, but were not eligible to vote. It is expected that the results will be forwarded to NIH, as part of the public comment process underway for their recently released draft guidelines. At the completion of the presentations, 155 students cast their ballots on a set of questions, the results of which were posted this morning on the Dartmouth website (http://www.dartmouth.edu/~ethics):

(1) On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being unimportant and 5 being extremely important) indicate how important to medicine you believe human stem cell research using cell lines derived from embryonic or fetal cells to be.

1.	UNIMPORTANT:	2 (1%)
2.		8 (5%)
3.		21 (14%)
4.		73 (48%)
5.	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	48 (32%)

(2) "As a matter of ethics, do you believe that the federal government

should,
by EXISTING or NEW law:

a. Prohibit ALL FEDERALLY FUNDED research using human stem cell lines
derived from embryos?

YES: 38 (25%)
NO: 116 (75%)

b. Prohibit not only all FEDERALLY FUNDED research using human stem cell
lines derived from embryos, but also all PRIVATELY FUNDED research of this sort?

YES: 22 (14%)
NO: 132 (86%)

c. Permit FEDERAL FUNDING of research USING (but not deriving) human stem
cell lines obtained from human embryos left over from infertility procedures and
donated with the consent of the involved patients?

YES: 100 (65%)
NO: 55 (35%)

d. Permit FEDERAL FUNDING of research USING and DERIVING human stem cell
lines obtained from human embryos left over from infertility procedures and
donated with the consent of the involved patients?

YES: 94 (61%)
NO: 59 (39%)

e. Permit FEDERAL FUNDING of research if human stem cell lines obtained
from frozen human embryos were EXPRESSLY CREATED by PRIVATELY funded researchers
for this purpose?

YES: 54 (35%)
NO: 100 (65%)

(3) "As a matter of ethics, do you believe that the federal government
should, by EXISTING or NEW law permit FEDERAL FUNDING only of research on adult
stem cells, i.e., those NOT derived from embryonic or fetal tissue?

YES: 48 (28%)
NO: 109 (72%)

PARTICIPANTS:

Science Panel

Daniel Marshak, Ph.D, Osiris Therapeutics
Robert Goldstein, MD, Ph.D, Juvenile Diabetes Foundation
Ron Mackay, MD, Ph.D, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke
(invited but unable to attend, due to weather)
Michael West, Ph.D, Advanced Cell Technology
Judy Smith, Ph.D, Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center

Ethics and Law Panel

Richard Doerflinger, National Conference of Catholic Bishops
Kevin Fitzgerald, JS, Ph.D, Loyola University Medical Center
Norman Fost, MD, MPH, University of Wisconsin
Eric Meslin, PhD, NBAC

Congressional Panel

Rep. Jay Dickey (R-Arkansas) (invited but unable to attend due to weather).

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: Jeffrey Bukowski <jbukowski@AGINGRESEARCH.ORG> (Jeffrey Bukowski <jbukowski@AGINGRESEARCH.ORG> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-JAN-2000 08:23:46.00

SUBJECT: Spotlight On Aging Research, Vol. 1, No. 4

TO: jbukowski@agingresearch.org (jbukowski@agingresearch.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Note: Some recipients have been dropped due to syntax errors.Please refer to the "$AdditionalHeaders" item for the complete headers.
SPOTLIGHT ON AGING RESEARCH

An Update By The Alliance For Aging Research

******

It's the eve of the New Hampshire primary, and presidential candidates have yet to address the importance of investing in aging research to offset the impact of the coming senior boom.

This failure is huge, for costs of age-related disease could rise like a tidal wave. By 2030 there will be more than 70 million people 65 or older,
twice the current number. In addition, the "oldest old," those 85 and older are the fastest-growing age group in the United States. Moderate Census Bureau estimates show that by mid-century, there will be 1 million people over 100 in America, twenty times the current number.

Unless the government invests in the necessary research to postpone, prevent or cure the diseases we commonly associate with aging, the total cost of health care in the United States could top $16 trillion by 2030 - almost 16 times its current level.

It would be much more reassuring to hear the Presidential candidates speak out about investing in research, in New Hampshire as well as all along
the campaign trail. Debating how to spend limited Medicare dollars as the sole answer won't cut it - unchecked, the need for Medicare services will be
much too great for any system to handle.

Only by investing in research will there be major savings in the care of older people in the coming decades. A five-year delay in onset of cardiovascular disease, for example, could save $69 billion annually. A five-year delay in the onset of urinary incontinence could save another $8 billion a year.

******

BULLETIN:

Speaking of research and aging, it's not too late to indicate your support for federal funding of stem cell research, new science with great promise for alleviating - even ending - many age-related diseases. Today is the deadline for commentary on proposed guidelines for providing this important new research with federal support.

Send in your positive comments by the end of today. Responding is easy and fast. Saying, "I support the NIH guidelines for federal funding of human
pluripotent stem cell research" will suffice.

For a look at the guidelines, see
www.nih.gov/news/stemcell/draftguidelines.htm

Responses can be sent to NIH by email: stemcell@mail.nih.gov, by fax: 301/402-0280; or, by regular mail: Stem Cell Guidelines, NIH Office of Science Policy, 1 Center Drive, Building 1, Room 218, Bethesda, MD 20892.

******

To learn more about the senior boom and the Alliance for Aging Research, visit the Alliance's Web site, www.agingresearch.org. At the Alliance's site, you can order "Putting Aging On Hold," an Alliance report about how preventing, postponing or curing the diseases of aging will save America billions of dollars.

The Winter edition of "Living Longer and Loving It!" is now available on the Alliance's Web site. This latest issue of the Alliance for Aging Research's electronic newsletter features an interview with Tufts nutritionist Jeffrey Blumberg on the best foods for healthy aging; a profile
of 82-year-old Ruth Ittner, who took her first hiking trip at six weeks old and hasn't stopped yet; and a story on how gene research will revolutionize 21st century medicine.

******
FAST FACTS:

ï¿½ Forty-seven percent of registered voters favor only minor changes to the Medicare system; 44 percent favor major changes.

ï¿½ A five-year delay in Alzheimer's disease could save the United States as much as $50 million annually.

ï¿½ Loss of independence to age-related disease in the United States costs an extra $26 billion annually.

ï¿½ Among registered voters, providing prescription drugs for the elderly and making Medicare financially sound are the biggest health care issues in the 2000 campaign.

******

Tell a friend! We encourage you to send this information to friends and
colleagues who might be interested.

To unsubscribe from this list serve, please write to
jbukowski@agingresearch.org and write "unsubscribe" in the subject line.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-JAN-2000 18:43:24.00

SUBJECT: the nyt mag story that did not come thru

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

TEXT:
The Recycled Generation
Stem-cell research holds the promise of an endless supply of new body parts, but it's bogged down in abortion politics and corporate rivalries, and shadowed by the possibility that the result might not be so great after all. By STEPHEN S. HALL

Almost every weekday morning, usually before 10:30, an overnight delivery truck with an unusual cargo negotiates the hilly streets on the outskirts of Worcester, Mass., and comes to a halt in front of a brick-and-tinted-glass building called Biotech Three. The courier disappears into the building with one or two large gray containers and drops them off at a small company called Advanced Cell Technology. The gray cases look like toolboxes, but they are actually sophisticated shipping containers, commonly used for transporting materials used in animal-breeding work, and they contain the starting material for a series of experiments that may completely rewrite the tables of human longevity. Or they may be remembered only for being among the most ethically troubling scientific endeavors of our times.

Inside the gray cases are hundreds of cow eggs -- big, plump and beautifully rotund oocytes, as they're technically known -- each one painstakingly plucked the day before from the ovaries of cows slaughtered in Iowa. They are doused with a marinade of enzymes that prime them for imminent fertilization and then sealed in small plastic test tubes before being shipped overnight to Worcester. On the drizzly, overcast day in mid-December when I visited the laboratories at Advanced Cell, the shipment of eggs arrived a little before me. In all the time that cows have roamed the planet, their oocytes have never encountered the insults they were about to face that day. The eggs would be stripped of their DNA, deliberately fused with human cells and fooled into thinking that fertilization had occurred, in the fervent commercial hope that some sort of an embryo might result.

Experimenting with embryos created from two different species -- to say nothing of engaging in a form of human cloning -- is an enterprise fraught with scientific and social uncertainty; indeed, Congress forbids the National Institutes of Health to finance any research involving human

embryos. So it's natural to wonder why a small, largely unknown and understaffed biotech company would risk public scorn and ethical outrage to perform such research. One possible reason is publicity, which a number of critics have been eager to suggest. But the real answer, insists Michael D. West, the dreamy-eyed 46-year-old entrepreneur who heads A.C.T., is the scientific chase for what he calls "the mother of all cells -- the embryonic stem cell."

The embryonic stem cell is an almost mythically powerful and versatile human cell, fleetingly present during the earliest days of embryonal development. This one cell has the potential -- the genetic blueprint and the biological know-how -- to become any cell, any tissue, any organ in the human body. With the proper biochemical coaxing, for example, it can turn into heart muscle, which could replace tissue damaged by a heart attack. Or into brain cells, which could be used to treat Parkinson's disease. Or into retinal cells, which could be used to restore failing vision.

Imagine, in short, a cell so protean and potent that it could theoretically generate an infinite supply of replaceable body parts -- organ and skin, sinew and bone, blood and brain -- to knit the tatters of disease, injury or old age. Imagine further that, with the use of controversial technologies like cloning, you might one day donate a snippet of your own skin, allowing scientists to harvest stem cells that theoretically would become a self-generated and limitless supply of transplant tissue -- tissue that would make a perfect immunological match with you because, after all, it is you. These ideas have not only been imagined; patents and licensing agreements are already in place.

"These are incredible cells," gushes Thomas B. Okarma of Geron Corporation, the California biotechnology company that controls many of the patents and licenses on stem cells. "I've been in biology since high school, and this is still a chilling technology when you see these things and realize what they do. The number of applications is mind-boggling." Last month, Science magazine dubbed stem-cell technology the "breakthrough of the year."

In spite of this promise, the scientific, commercial and ethical landscapes that intersect with these fascinating cells have been shaped, even turned upside down, by the right-to-life debate, because in order to obtain human embryonic stem cells by currently available technology, you must destroy a human embryo. Because of the Congressional ban on financing of this research, many scientists now find themselves in the awkward position of possibly losing their jobs if they try to use human stem cells to devise new treatments for many common diseases. "With stem cells," says Ronald McKay, a researcher at the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke in Bethesda, "you tickle them and they jump through hoops for you." McKay's group published a highly regarded paper in Science last summer showing how rat embryonic-stem cells could be used to treat a version of multiple sclerosis in rats, but he doesn't dare extend the research to test the method's effectiveness in humans. "I would get fired if I did that," McKay says, fairly squirming in his seat to make this seem like the most reasonable thing in the world.

The ban on N.I.H. financing has also had the collateral effect of

relegating the technology to the private sector, where embryo research can proceed unencumbered. But the fact that so much of this controversial research now occurs in the private sector means that public discussion has become constrained. And complicating this commercial landscape is the fact that two of the companies most avidly competing over the research, Geron and Advanced Cell Technology, have a tangled corporate history dating back to business opportunities created by the federal ban.

The common figure wandering through all these unsettled landscapes, popping up again and again like some white-coated Zelig is Michael West. West's insistence on pursuing controversial experiments in which cow eggs are used as cellular incubators in an attempt to create humanlike embryos comes at a particularly sensitive moment. Emboldened by a legal interpretation that seemed to show a way around the Congressional ban, the N.I.H. on Dec. 2 issued long-awaited guidelines explaining the rules by which the agency would finance human-stem-cell research. The 60-day comment period ends tomorrow, and the agency hopes to begin soliciting grant proposals from university researchers sometime this summer.

However, Representative Jay Dickey, a Republican from Arkansas who has blocked N.I.H. financing for embryo research since 1995, has already vowed to outlaw federally financed stem-cell research this spring, either through legislation or legal action. Senator Arlen Specter, meanwhile, who is entranced by the medical possibilities, has promised to introduce a bill explicitly allowing federal financing for the research.

West, whose laid-back, soft-spoken demeanor belies the soul of a headstrong provocateur, promises to be an impassioned voice in this debate, too. "I think a lot of the problem we have in trying to develop these new technologies for medicine is people's knee-jerk reaction to words like 'fetal' and 'embryo,'" he says. "You know, you use the word 'fetal' and people just go completely irrational."

Until we learn how to direct the fate of human embryonic stem cells -- learn how to tell them, for example, that we'd like them to become a new liver or glistening white bone -- their enormous promise still remains under Nature's lock and key. Many scientists believe it will take at least 10 years before we learn how to program the development of cells that could be transplanted into humans, and probably many more before we learn how to coax stem cells into creating something as grand and complex as a liver or a kidney.

But let's say some version of the science will be in practice by the year 2011, when the first of the baby boomers turn 65. And let's say the technology of stem cells will be complemented by promissory notes redeemed in related fields of gerontological science. What might the menu of spare parts look like?

The first step in creating those spare parts (which could be used not only for the aged but also for anyone in need of intervention) might well be the

donation by the patient of a biopsy sample, which could be quickly cloned, thus creating an early embryo, which would produce stem cells in a week or so. Every cell and every tissue derived from those stem cells would be a perfect immunological match, which would immediately circumvent the big stumbling block of current transplant medicine: matching tissue.

At that point, it simply becomes a matter of matching the ailment to the right cell type. Researchers speak of creating nerve cells to treat spinal-cord injuries, stroke and Alzheimer's disease; glial cells for multiple sclerosis; pancreatic islet cells to treat diabetes; muscle cells for muscular dystrophy; chondrocytes for arthritis; hepatocytes for cholesterol metabolism; endothelial vessels to grow new blood vessels to replace vessels clogged by fat and plaque -- there are more than 200 different cell types in the body, and stem cells can theoretically be nudged to form each one. If these cells are souped up, as has been proposed, with an enzyme that maintains its cellular youthfulness, we're talking not only about replacement parts, but also about parts that never grow old.

What might the world of stem-cell medicine look like? For one thing, every place in the developed world might look a lot more like Florida. Although the maximum attainable human life span is now approximately 120 years, only about 65,000 Americans have currently reached the age of 100. But a century from now, with new medical technologies in place, the Census Bureau predicts there will be 5.3million people living to the age of 100 and perhaps much longer. To hear the optimists talk, there'll be much longer waits for tennis courts and tee times.

This is the kind of speculation that keeps ethicists and philosophers busy, but there are a lot of touchier issues on the immediate horizon -- creating embryos for research purposes, combining biological material from different species and performing nuclear-transfer experiments involving adult human cells (also known as cloning). All three are being pursued in a single line of research at Advanced Cell Technology.

he experiments at A.C.T. take place in a long, dark, narrow room in the middle of the lab. The lights are kept low to allow technicians to view the cells through microscopes while poking, turning and prodding them with micromanipulation devices. K.C. Cunniff, her blond hair spilling out over a white lab coat, begins by vacuuming all of the cow's genetic material from the egg cells, one after another, for more than an hour.

As I watch a magnified view of the proceedings on a television monitor, it's hard not to be impressed by the nimble piecework of the technicians. Cunniff, 26, deftly maneuvers one pipette to hold a round, plump egg cell in place. (They prefer cow eggs because they are inexpensive and easier to use than either pig or primate oocytes). She turns the egg, which had previously been stained with a fluorescing dye, as if rotating a ball in her hand, until she sees a telltale blue-green speck of DNA. Using her other hand, she nudges a sharp, hollow needle up against the surface of the egg. With a precise thrust, she enters the egg, sucks out the DNA and withdraws the needle, all in a matter of seconds. "Very quick," she says matter-of-factly. In, suction, out. Next egg. In, suction, out.
"A lot of the problem we have in trying to develop these new technologies

for medicine is people's knee-jerk reaction to words like 'fetal' and 'embryo.'"

It's so matter-of-fact that you'd never guess this type of experiment was the focus of wildly fearful predictions only a few years ago. In 1997, when scientists at the Roslin Institute in Scotland announced the cloning of Dolly the sheep, there was a lot of fevered speculation about the possibility of cloning human beings. It was generally dismissed as both a distant and undesirable proposition, but the sudden appeal of embryonic stem cells has provided a surprisingly urgent medical justification for moving the technology of human cloning closer to reality.

In the case of A.C.T.'s experiments, the cow egg is being tested as a way to "reprogram," or reset, the adult DNA back to a pristine state resembling the moment of fertilization. In these experiments, the egg comes from a cow but the adult DNA comes from human donors; it's the human DNA, West believes, that orchestrates subsequent embryonic development. The technical term for this type of experiment is "nuclear transfer," but West prefers a more transparent phrase -- human therapeutic cloning." That modifier "therapeutic" signals that A.C.T. is not in the business of making babies, just embryos to get stem cells. And they're not alone in pursuing the nuclear-transfer approach. Last May, to remarkably little public comment, Geron acquired Roslin Bio-Med, the Scottish company in charge of commercializing the research that produced Dolly.

As Cunniff moves another cow egg into position, Nancy Sawyer gazes at the TV monitor and makes a sound like "Unk!" as the needle punctures the egg. "That's so cool," she whispers of the image. Seen on the monitor, the image has a primal iconic beauty, like a dim grainy photograph of a distant planet. On each moonlike oocyte, one isolated lunar mare glows with an eerie greenish blue, betraying the location of genetic material that will soon be suctioned away.

At a nearby microscope, Sawyer, 24, performs the next step. Human skin cells, known as fibroblasts, have been provided by an anonymous donor. The human cells dot the screen like so many lumpy, transparent potatoes, much smaller than the egg cells. Sawyer loads them into a hollow needle, immobilizes a cow egg with suction and, with gentle pressure, inserts the needle tip just under the rind of the egg. With a squeeze of her hand, a single human skin cell, with its unique payload of human DNA, plops into the egg of a creature that moos. Sawyer even manages to maneuver her needle tip to literally tuck the hole closed.

After stuffing every cow egg with its little spud of human DNA, Sawyer prepares the next step. She gives the cells a zap of 120 volts. The jolt of electricity effectively fuses man and beast into a single biological fate. After one final step, this . . . this thing will believe it has been
fertilized and, if all goes well, begin cleaving, or dividing, in the bubbling, momentous arithmetic of life lifting off the pad: 2 cells, 4 cells, 8 cells, 16 cells, 32 cells -- blastocyst!

The odds are extremely long that any of the 100 or so cell fusions will result in a blastocyst, the hollow ball of cells that appear about a week

after fertilization and, in a normal embryo, are destined to become the placenta. But if that ball of cells should form, a separate group of cells known as the inner cell mass assembles against one inside wall of the blastocyst, like bats huddling on the ceiling of a cave, and this is where the embryonic stem cells will appear. These stem cells exist only briefly before they begin to differentiate into more specialized tissues -- there one moment and gone the next, transients vanishing into the great biology of becoming. "If I'm lucky," says Jose Cibelli, vice president of research at A.C.T., "I'll get one blastocyst. That's how low the efficiency is." And getting the blastocyst is just the first hurdle -- can they isolate the stem cells and keep them alive in a test tube? And will they truly act like human embryonic stem cells?

Before leaving Worcester that day, I ask Cibelli when he will know if any blastocysts have formed from the experiment I've observed. He says he wouldn't expect to see anything before 9 or 10 days. I do the math in my head and make a mental note to get in touch either on December 24 or Christmas Day.

In many ways Michael West is the shadow impresario of the field. As founder of Geron Corporation, one of this decade's most closely watched biotechnology companies, and now as president and C.E.O. of Advanced Cell Technology, West has achieved remarkable success as a kind of merchant of immortality, selling the idea that stem cells and related technologies might someday completely revise the tables of average human life span. And he is so convinced that the promise of stem cells justifies a controversial strategy like cow-human nuclear transfer that he is happy to foster, if not force, a national discussion of this technology.

In a recent issue of the journal Nature Medicine, for example, West, Cibelli and their colleague Robert Lanza argued the case for human therapeutic cloning because stem-cell research is so promising. "Does a blastocyst," they wrote, "warrant the same rights and reverence as that accorded a living soul -- a parent, a child or a partner -- who might die because we failed to move the moral line?" And that is what Mike West is trying to do at this touchy juncture of the stem-cell wars -- with this company, in these experiments, in an ethical debate that has seemed too arcane and complicated to attract much public attention to date. He is putting his shoulder to the moral line that forbids embryo research and is trying to force some sort of social reckoning. The degree to which he and others succeed or fail may well determine if stem cells have a chance to live up to their promise as medicine or remain too hot to handle in the current political climate.

Stem cells burst into public consciousness little more than a year ago. In November 1998, James Thomson of the University of Wisconsin reported the creation of human embryonic stem (or E.S.) cell lines. Using leftover frozen embryos from in-vitro fertilization clinics in Wisconsin and Israel, Thomson and colleagues isolated stem cells and have shown that they can be maintained indefinitely in the lab -- can be grown, frozen and then thawed, and still retain their power to develop into, say, heart-muscle cells or brain cells. Michael Shamblott and John Gearhart, at the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, headed a separate effort to cultivate something called "embryonic germline" (E.G.) cells, which are harvested from a tiny speck of

fetal tissue from an aborted fetus and then grown in the lab. Because of the Congressional ban on federal financing for human-embryo experimentation, both teams conducted the research with financing from Geron.

There are many technical hurdles to overcome. But the sheer power of the approach makes it clear that, if properly harnessed, stem cells could serve as a warehouse of spare human parts. This teasing hint of immortality is the cultural subtext that runs beneath the public fascination with the science, and no one has done more to promote that connection than West. The son of a truck mechanic, West is a onetime creationist and a self-styled truth seeker, and his entrepreneurial interest in the biology of aging derives from an obsessive, almost morbid fascination with death. "All I think about, all day long, every day, is human mortality and our own aging," he says.

The first time I visited Advanced Cell Technology, West showed up two hours late for our appointment, apologized with sheepish charm for his tardiness and began to spin out the kind of polished futurism he regularly conveys to scientists, investors and lay people. "I thought I'd show you some pictures," he said, and then proceeded to project slides on a screen in the company's conference room, delivering a lecture on the biology of aging to an audience of one. With his gently soothing Midwestern voice and relentlessly upbeat brand of biological positivism, he manages to make science sound almost like a cult. Former colleagues concede that he does not possess a crisp management style (punctuality, for example, being a continuing challenge), but even his critics admit he has a knack for looking beyond the horizon and dreaming deep. He'll talk for hours about saving endangered species through cloning, or the possibility of cloning pets, or why it makes more economic and ethical sense to pay $1 for a cow egg than $2,000 to surgically obtain a single human egg. "He's a very visionary guy," says James Thomson, a University of Wisconsin biologist, "but he's also a very good salesman."

Even as a high-school student growing up in Niles, Mich., West was fascinated with aging and rejuvenation. He immersed himself in religion and philosophy. He learned Hebrew and Greek, he says, to read ancient texts in the original. He went on to study psychology at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, obtained a Masters of Science degree at Andrews University, a Seventh-day Adventist school, and even studied creationism for a time in San Diego, he says, before convincing himself of the truth of Darwinian evolution. Following the death of his father in 1980, West worked in the family's truck-leasing business and then belatedly embarked on a career in science. He received his Ph.D. in cell biology from the Baylor College of Medicine in 1989 and started medical school at the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center in Dallas.

That same year, West showed up unannounced and began to hang out at the University of Texas lab of Woodring Wright and Jerry Shay, who were researching the molecular biology of aging. Four years earlier, scientists had discovered a critically important enzyme called telomerase, which acts on telomeres, the little caps of DNA at the end of chromosomes; telomeres ordinarily grow shorter each time a cell divides, until the cells stop dividing altogether. It turned out that a handful of human cells -- germ

cells, cancer cells and embryonic stem cells -- use telomerase to circumvent that shortening process, and thus also circumvent the aging process and achieve a cellular version of immortality.

As West learned more about telomeres, he eventually came to view the enzyme telomerase as a molecular version of the fountain of youth; it looked as if it might bestow immortality on normal cells and, conversely, could have the beneficial effect of pulling the plug on immortality in cancer cells if blocked. While still technically enrolled in medical school, West moved out to California and banged on doors in search of seed money for a biotech startup. Thus, in November 1990, he founded a company dedicated to the molecular causes of aging. He named it Geron -- Greek for "old person." He eventually captured the interest of the most prestigious venture-capital firm on the West Coast, Kleiner Perkins Caufield & Byers, which along with other firms invested $7.6 million in Geron in 1992.

For a company that has lost tens of millions of dollars and is in no danger of curing aging anytime soon, Geron has managed to cast a spell on investors, the media and the lay public. In both technical articles and news releases, it has retailed a scientific vision (and vocabulary) that clearly push the right zeitgeist buttons. West and Geron spoke tirelessly of "immortalizing enzymes" and the "life extension" of cells; Geron is almost universally recognized as an "anti-aging" company. And in 1997, after winning a highly competitive race to clone (and patent) the human gene for telomerase, Geron actually had a real molecule around which to develop clinical products. The company currently has a number of promising directions for telomerase-based products, including potential anticancer applications, but the mythology is so firmly established that even though company officials insist Geron is no longer an "anti-aging company," this is still how it is inevitably portrayed.

From the very beginning, however, West had another big idea he wanted to pursue. "You need replaceable cells and tissues for the problems of aging as well," he said. "And it seemed to me that the ideal source for an aging population is to go back to the beginning of life." To the embryo, that is, and stem cells. And so, as early as 1992, he paid a visit to Roger Pedersen, a professor of obstetrics, gynecology and reproductive sciences at the University of California at San Francisco, and a leading expert on embryonic stem cells in mice. They both agreed that the time had arrived to explore the vast potential of such embryonic stem cells in human medicine, and West inquired into whether Pedersen would accept financing from Geron to do research on human stem cells.

Pedersen flatly refused: "This area of investigation is something that is at the headwaters, and it's not appropriate for private investors to control the headwaters of a stream of research."

Several years later, however, Pedersen got back in touch with West. Circumstances had changed, he said, and he was ready to deal.

he circumstances were political. In 1975, federal regulations stipulated that any government support for in-vitro-fertilization research required the approval of a federal ethics advisory board. After a short and turbulent history, this board was disbanded in 1980 without a single

research project having received government funds. One cynical stratagem of the Reagan and Bush administrations, according to Pedersen, was to block all attempts to reconstitute the panel, effectively thwarting such research throughout the 1980's.

Under the new Clinton administration, Congress did away with the phantom federal ethics review and set up a special N.I.H. committee to establish guidelines for human-embryo research. Everything seemed back on track when, early in 1995, Jay Dickey, the Republican congressman from Arkansas, successfully inserted a rider into the budget bill for the Department of Health and Human Services (which includes the N.I.H.) banning federal funds for human embryo research. Just as right-to-life politics had forced in-vitro fertilization and reproductive biology into the private sector, where lack of oversight and regulation has led to a series of well-documented scandals, stem-cell research seemed headed for similar privatization.

Those were the circumstances that had changed Roger Pedersen's mind. Geron reached an agreement with the University of California to finance Pedersen's work on embryonic stem cells. During his discussions with West, Pedersen mentioned that a scientist at the University of Wisconsin, James Thomson, was about to publish a paper announcing another breakthrough: the isolation of embryonic stem cells from rhesus monkeys. West was in Wisconsin the next day, and Geron signed up Thomson too.

"I would have been much happier with public support," Thomson admits. "But given the constraints, I welcomed the funding I got." Getting access to stem cells from a primate, an animal biologically close to humans, West realized, promised tremendous intellectual-property dividends. "We could just learn how to work with them, and file patents," he said. "But we'd have this head start on the whole world." When West later learned that another university researcher, John Gearhart at Johns Hopkins, had made significant progress isolating cells very similar to embryonic stem cells, he headed straight for Baltimore. "He just showed up on my doorstep one day," Gearhart recalled with a laugh.

With Pedersen acting as talent scout, West chased down and signed up three of the leading stem-cell researchers in the world. Geron began to assemble a staggering intellectual-property portfolio in a field with almost limitless medical potential. And because the Congressional right-to-life advocates had effectively tied the N.I.H.'s hands in terms of financing, there wasn't any competing research in university labs. The investment paid off spectacularly in November 1998, when both Thomson and Gearhart announced they had isolated human stem cells. The universities where the work was done retained the patents on the research, but Geron received exclusive rights to many applications.

Unfortunately, Mike West enjoyed this moment of triumph only vicariously, because by then he had left the company, unhappily. In 1997, according to several sources, Geron planned to spin off its entire stem-cell program into a separate company, which would include West, when the plan, in the words of a scientific board member of the company, "got clobbered by the company leadership." Thomas Okarma, who joined Geron in December 1997 and is now president, offers a different interpretation. "I was hired

explicitly to run that program because it really wasn't moving," he said. In any event, the stem-cell research stayed at Geron, and West says he increasingly felt he could do more outside the confines of the company than inside.

The fact that West's current company, Advanced Cell Technology, is now competing against the company he founded may go a long way toward explaining why Mike West is so determined to find an alternative way of obtaining human stem cells, one that doesn't rely on existing human embryos in clinics or fetal material from abortions -- the methods that Wisconsin and Johns Hopkins licensed to Geron. And it certainly explains why he perked up when, a few months after leaving Geron, he learned of an unusual experiment by Jose Cibelli, an Argentinian scientist working at Advanced Cell Technology. The good news was that Cibelli had tried to isolate human stem cells using a method that seemed to offer an alternative to Geron's approach. The bad news was that the strategy involved human cloning. And cows. "And I knew," West says, "that was going to be a problem."

In the summer of 1996, Cibelli was a graduate student at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, working in the laboratory of James Robl, a respected developmental biologist. Cibelli had the radical idea of fusing some of his own cells with cow egg cells, in effect cloning himself -- not to make a copy, of course, but as a way to get human stem cells. Interestingly, this wasn't the first time Robl had been confronted with such an idea. Several years earlier, a student in the lab, unbeknown to Robl, had fused human cells with the egg cells of a rabbit, and the cells had begun to divide. This time, Robl went to university officials and received institutional approval to proceed.

During July and August, Cibelli rinsed out some of the cells that lined the inside of his cheeks and tried fusing them with cow egg cells. "One day, Jose was about to go on vacation, and he was about to throw out the dish," Robl recalls. "I don't generally look at these things, but I did that day. And there was a blastocyst." In other words, the embryolike thing had moved beyond mere cell division and graduated to the stage where embryonic stem cells begin to form. As is routine when the experiment reaches this stage, Cibelli placed the fragile blastocyst on a bed of fetal mouse cells, which nourished its further development. "We watched it for about two more weeks," Robl says. "It looked, to my eye, not like a cow blastocyst. The morphology of the cells was different."

Cibelli and Robl did not publicly discuss the experiment at the time, nor did they prepare a scientific report for peer review. "We never considered a publication," Robl explains, "because there was not nearly sufficient data." But the University of Massachusetts did consider the experiment sufficiently novel to file a patent application. The United States patent was issued, virtually unnoticed, last August.

With a squeeze of the technician's hand, a single human skin cell, with its unique payload of human DNA, plops into the egg of a creature that moos.

Cibelli recounted this remarkable story to West in the spring of 1998, when

West happened to be visiting A.C.T. "I was just flabbergasted," West recalls. "I mean, he showed me human embryos that had been made by cloning. And I had no idea -- no one in the world had any idea -- that it had been done. I thought, 'Oh my gosh, this is exactly what I want to be doing for the next 10 or 20 years of my life.'" More to the point, it was exactly the kind of technology that would allow him to get back into the stem-cell game.

West officially joined A.C.T. in October 1998 and immediately presided over an episode that was, for him, uncharacteristic -- a major public-relations fiasco. As soon as West joined the company, Cibelli lobbied to resume his cloning experiments. West agreed, but wanted to disclose details of the 1996 experiment and gauge public reaction to the technology before starting it up again. "I didn't want to be accused of doing this in secret," he says. So he invited a film crew from the CBS newsmagazine "48 Hours" to film the work in progress.

Then, one week before the scheduled broadcast, on Nov. 6, West got blindsided by his previous life. Geron announced Thomson and Gearhart's successes isolating stem cells. "I had no idea it was coming," West admitted. It wasn't just that the research made front-page headlines and drove Geron stock up 74 percent in one day. By the time CBS broadcast the show on Nov. 12, along with a news account of the experiments that appeared in that morning's New York Times, West's professed desire for openness looked like something entirely different: a bid to leverage "me too" publicity for his otherwise unknown company.

For an experiment that never received formal peer review, Cibelli's cow-human nuclear-transfer work got plenty of unofficial feedback, beginning with the White House. Clinton called it "deeply troubling." Thomas Murray, president of the Hastings Center and a leading bioethicist, wondered "if the timing of the announcement had to do with scientific competition, personal competition or positioning for funding from investors." Roger Pedersen was quoted as saying, "I smell a sham." (He claims he wasn't told who performed the experiment when he was asked to comment upon it.) Thomson regarded the whole affair as "unfortunate." Right-to-life pickets showed up outside Biotech Three in Worcester, marching around in cow masks.

Two days after news of the cow-human experiments broke, President Clinton asked his National Bioethics Advisory Commission to prepare a report on stem-cell research in general. The commission hastily convened hearings in January 1999 in Washington. And who should turn up, uninvited, to make an unscheduled presentation before the panel but Michael West.

"I read an editorial by an individual who wrote that science should stop so that ethics can catch up," West told the national commission that day. His ambition, he said, was "to communicate to people in public policy and in biomedical ethics, so that, simply, ethics can walk hand in hand with science." Ethics and modern biology, however, have rarely walked hand in hand, and stem-cell research has added new difficulties to the relationship.

Over the past year, two high-powered advisory committees have, with one

significant difference, endorsed the general idea of embryonic-stem-cell research. A committee established by the American Association for the Advancement of Science recommended last August that researchers be able to receive public funds for experiments on embryonic stem cells, but only using cell lines already created by researchers in the private sector. The National Bioethics Advisory Commission, by contrast, recommended last September that researchers financed by the N.I.H. should be allowed to create stem cells using human embryos already in existence (thousands of such embryos, frozen and destined to be discarded, exist at in-vitro fertilization clinics).

But no oversight or guidelines exist for private industry, and in February 1999, well before either committee delivered its opinion, Advanced Cell Technology quietly decided to resume its cow-human nuclear-transfer experiments. It seemed like an important decision for such socially sensitive research, so I asked West if it was something that went to the board or an ethics advisory panel for approval. West said it was strictly his decision. And there's the paradox. Now that abortion politics has forced so much of the research into the private sector, the transparency of the ethical conversation about it has become more obscured.

Everyone, including Mike West, insists on an open national debate about stem-cell research. But I began to notice that whenever I asked one question too many about exactly what work was being done, or even contemplated, the conversations became elliptical and vague. I was having lunch with West one day, for example, when I asked if the use of human donor eggs for cloning experiments was under consideration. Cibelli had told me he thought such a development was very likely. "I have to confer on this issue," West replied apologetically, leaning over to huddle with A.C.T.'s public-relations adviser. Then, after a pause but without directly answering the question, he expressed concern that such a program could exploit women.

For all their good intentions, ethicists may have allowed themselves to be placed in a difficult, possibly untenable position. At Geron, for instance, the company's ethics advisory board seems to have the ear of management. But, says Karen Lebacqz, who heads the Geron ethics advisory board, "they are perfectly at liberty to ignore all our advice." Further, as Lebacqz points out, she is not free to discuss certain aspects of the research. "Early last summer, they brought us a piece of research that they were going to fund. Several members of the board raised objections, so they decided not to pursue that particular line of research." What was the research under discussion? "I'm sorry, I really can't," she said.

The ethicists have become proxies for all of us, precisely because so much of this technology, for political reasons, is unfolding in the private sector. Yet they have limited power. West, for example, told me that when Geron first considered establishing an ethics board, the company determined that giving such a board the right to veto research projects would undermine its fiduciary responsibilities to shareholders. The ethicists have what West calls "the power of the pen," but what they can report back to us is constrained.

Their mere participation in the process, however, creates the appearance of

oversight and ethical responsibility, and that is precisely what bothers David Cox, vice chairman of the genetics department at Stanford University and a member of the national bioethics commission. Cox says ethics advisory boards at biotech companies are "a joke": "They're supposedly doing ethical review, but the process by which they're working is backwards."

It's very hard to have a national debate on issues as socially and ethically important as cloning and the creation of embryonic stem cells when every conversation may ultimately bump up against corporate confidentiality. The problem of openness is compounded by the editorial policy at a number of leading scientific journals, which refuse to publish research if the results have previously been disclosed in public. That almost guarantees that breakthroughs in a controversial and competitive field of research like stem cells will land in the public's lap as scientific faits accomplis, just as Dolly did.

And it leaves us in the same scientifically uncertain and ethically queasy place we were more than a year ago. At that time, Thomas Murray of the national bioethics commission asked West if he thought the cow-human experiments resulted in human embryos that were potentially "viable" -- in other words, embryos that, if implanted in a woman, could result in a live human being. West didn't answer, and A.C.T. still isn't answering. I asked Jose Cibelli, for example, if the A.C.T. scientists had made any progress overcoming the problem of biological incompatibility between a cow egg and a human cell, an issue involving small cellular organs called mitochondria; it is an obstacle repeatedly raised by the many scientists who remain skeptical about the approach and are dubious that a blastocyst would be created, especially since A.C.T. still hasn't published a sprig of data on it in more than a year.

"We think," Cibelli began to say, "but this is very preliminary. . . . " He shrugged and smiled. "You can say that we've had good progress," he continued with a little laugh. "We've had good progress, and we expect to have something to report in the near future. But I guess I need to be protective of the data for publication's sake."

Michael West sounded a similar theme when I told him how many complaints I'd heard about A.C.T's unpublished experiments. "We could publish now, the data we have," West assured me, well aware of the exasperation of the research community. "But," he continued, "we're trying to generate a real killer paper here. We're going to do a paper we're proud of."

On Christmas Eve, I sent an e-mail to Jose Cibelli, asking about the status of the cells I'd seen fused. The day after Christmas he wrote back to report that the nuclear-transfer units had "developed at the 'predictable' rate," while declining to specify exactly what that was. As soon as new techniques were in place, he continued, Advanced Cell Technology would report the results in a peer-reviewed journal.

As congress prepares to debate the merits of stem-cell research in the coming months, we will undoubtedly hear rosy visions of the future of medicine with stem cells (as well as the contorted political logic that suggests that research on human embryos and cross-species nuclear-transfer experiments are permissible in the private sector, but morally indefensible

in the public sector). But it's also worth thinking through the implications of immortalizing medicines, which I had the opportunity to do with Leonard Hayflick, the elder statesman (and elder contrarian) of the field.

Hayflick, now 71, is a well-known cell biologist; his discovery in 1961 that normal human cells grown in a test tube simply stop dividing after a specific number of cell divisions, known as the Hayflick limit, in effect introduced the notion of mortality into the biology of aging. We arranged to meet at the Union Club in Manhattan in early December, when Hayflick showed up to harangue fellow board members of the American Federation for Aging Research about their financing priorities.

Hayflick doubts we'll ever have a quick fix to arrest aging anytime soon, but he has lots of reasons to think it would be a very bad idea. Like a number of bioethicists, he believes the first line of division is economic. Access to the regenerative medicine of stem-cell and immortalizing enzymes is most likely to be a phenomenon available only to affluent segments of the population in the developed world.

In his book "How and Why We Age" and other writings, Hayflick has even gone to the trouble of imagining "bizarre situations" that might unfold if scientists were ultimately able to create a medication that would, from the moment treatment began, essentially freeze the process of aging at a certain point. He has imagined "children becoming biologically older than their parents" if a parent chose to stop aging at age 45, for example, while a child did nothing. How would you even know, he asks, the right age to stop at?

Karen Lebacqz has also pondered this distant future. "If we are successful with the use of stem cells or in the reprogramming of cells," she says, "it will mean that people are no longer dying of the things we are dying of today. What do we do with all of ourselves if we don't die?" We'll squander even more of the world's resources, she continues, and put even more pressure on the developing world.

But perhaps the ultimate argument against the implicit promise of immortality has to do with a simple biological fact: if we were to rejuvenate our brains, Hayflick argues, we might lose the most precious thing we have: our sense of self. "Given the possibility that we could replace all our parts, including our brain, then you lose your self-identity, your self-recognition. You lose who you are! You are who you are because of your memory."

There is a lot of scientific research and a lot of heated political debate to come before we arrive at any of those distant quandaries. And how we resolve the ethical conversations we're in the midst of having over stem cells will have a lot to say about whether we'll have a chance of reaching that future at all.

---

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

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

608-262-5015 (tel)
608-262-5485 (fax)

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

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:31-JAN-2000 18:36:11.00

SUBJECT: Re: fyi from the ny times magazine

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

TEXT:
mine as well but I presume it was the article on stem cell research,
right? 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: 1-FEB-2000 12:32:31.00

SUBJECT: FW: Specter/Harkin Bill

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

TEXT:
Below is a copy of the Specter/Harkin stem cell bill that was introduced yesterday - S. 2015 or the "Stem Cell Research Act of 2000" It was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and is up on Thomas. The Labor HHS subcommittee does plan to have their next stem cell hearing on Tuesday, February 22. We'll send you a
report on the hearing. (NBAC may also be asked to testify).

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

To amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research with respect to human embryonic stem cells.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the `Stem Cell Research Act of 2000'.

SEC. 2. RESEARCH ON HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS.

Part G of the Title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 288 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 498B the

following:

'SEC. 498C. RESEARCH ON HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS.

'(a) IN GENERAL- Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may only conduct, support, or fund research on, or utilizing, human embryos for the purpose of generating embryonic stem cells in accordance with this section.

'(b) SOURCES OF EMBRYONIC CELLS- For purposes of carrying out research under paragraph (1), the human embryonic stem cells involved shall be derived only from embryos that otherwise would be discarded that have been donated from in-vitro fertilization clinics with the written informed consent of the progenitors.

'(c) RESTRICTIONS-

'(1) IN GENERAL- The following restriction shall apply with respect to human embryonic stem cell research conducted or supported under subsection (a):

'(A) The research involved shall not result in the creation of human embryos.

'(B) The research involved shall not result in the reproductive cloning of a human being.

'(2) PROHIBITION-

'(A) IN GENERAL- It shall be unlawful for any person receiving Federal funds to knowingly acquire, receive, or otherwise transfer any human gametes or human embryos for valuable consideration if the acquisition, receipt, or transfer affects interstate commerce.

'(B) DEFINITION- In subparagraph (A), the term 'valuable consideration' does not include reasonable payments associated with transportation, transplantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage.

'(d) GUIDELINES-

'(1) IN GENERAL- The Secretary, in conjunction with the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall issue guidelines governing human embryonic stem cell research under this section, including the definitions and terms used for purposes of such research.

'(2) REQUIREMENTS- The guidelines issued under paragraph (1) shall ensure that--

'(A) all Federal research protocols and consent forms involving human embryonic stem cell research must be reviewed and approved by an institutional review board; and

'(B) the institutional review board is empowered to make a

determination as to whether or not the proposed research is in accordance with National Institutes of Health Guidelines for Research Involving Human Pluripotent Stem Cells.

`(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.- Not later than January 1, 2001, and each January 1 thereafter, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the activities carried out under this section during the preceding fiscal year, and including a description of whether and to what extent research under subsection (a) has been conducted in accordance with this section.'.

****

Tim Leshan
Director of Public Policy
American Society for Cell Biology
tleshan@ascb.org
www.jscpp.org/jscpp
301-530-7153 (p)
301-530-7139 (f)

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Richard Davis <rdavis@usaid.gov> (Richard Davis <rdavis@usaid.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-FEB-2000 13:15:31.00

SUBJECT: stem cell research comment period extended

TO: sefellows@aaas.org (sefellows@aaas.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Forwarded from Research!America

Dear Medical and Health Research Advocates,

The NIH has extended the public comment period on its draft guidelines for research involved stem cells for three weeks. Written comments should be received by NIH on or before February 22, 2000.

If you ran out of time or didn't find out about the comment period until too late, please take the time to do it now. Negative comments continue to pour in from organized campaigns across the country, so it is absolutely vital that you take action today. If you would like to read the guidelines, they can be found at http://www.nih.gov/news/stemcell/draftguidelines.htm.

Below are a few talking points that can be used in drafting your comments, which do not need to be extensive. In fact, you can simply send an e-mail or fax saying that you support the draft guidelines. Send your completed response to stemcell@mail.nih.gov or fax to Stem Cell Guidelines at (301)402-0280.

Public sector funding for biomedical research - what the draft guidelines would permit - is strongly favored by a vast majority of Americans. For example, a May 1999 survey by Opinion Research Corporation, found that three out of four Americans support funding stem cell research through the NIH.

Research already being conducted suggests that stem cells have the potential to speed the day when life-saving therapies are available for tens of millions of patients and their families.

I commend the thoughtful balance reflected in the guidelines between
issues of science and issues of ethics.

Please pass this on to fellow colleagues and feel free to call us at (703)739-2577 x17 if you have any questions. In addition, please copy sbeck@researchamerica.org on your correspondence to NIH so we can gauge the response of our advocacy network. Thanks to all of you who have already passed this message along.

For those who prefer to mail their comments, they should be addressed to: Stem Cell Guidelines, NIH Office of Science Policy, 1 Center Drive, Building 1, Room 218, Bethesda, MD 20892.

--

Stephanie A. Beck
Assistant Director, 435 Project
Research!America
908 King Street, Suite 400E
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703)739-2577 x17

****

Richard Davis, Ph.D. (Dick Davis)
AAAS Science and Diplomacy Fellow
USAID (US Agency for International Development)
Israeli Programs and MERC, CDR, CAR
Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research
EGAD/DAA/IP
Room 2-11-104, Ronald Reagan Building
1300 Pennsylavania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20523-2110
rdavis@usaid.gov (Alt. e-mail: rdavis@murray.fordham.edu)
202-712-1135
202- 216-3025 (fax)

****

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Gadbois, Ellen (OD)" <GadboisE@od.nih.gov> ("Gadbois, Ellen (OD)" <GadboisE@od.nih.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-FEB-2000 13:41:13.00

SUBJECT: FW: Specter & Harkin's comments on stem cell bill introduction

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

TEXT:
-----Original Message-----
From: Gadbois, Ellen (OD)
Sent: Tuesday, February 01, 2000 9:41 AM
To: Alice; Debra; Elisa; Eric; Hanna, Kathi; Kerry Jo; Marjorie;
Rob;
Speers, Marjorie (CDC); Stu
Subject: Specter & Harkin's comments on stem cell bill introduction

<<bill intro comments.doc>>

Note Harkin's comments regarding NBAC.

Ellen L. Gadbois, Ph.D.
National Bioethics Advisory Commission
6100 Executive Boulevard, Suite 5B01
Rockville, MD 20892-7508
voice: (301) 402-4242
fax: (301) 480-6900
email: GadboisE@OD.NIH.GOV
http://www.bioethics.gov

- bill intro comments.doc========== ATTACHMENT 1 ==========
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D1]ARMS22239383E.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:
========== END ATTACHMENT 1 ==========

STEM CELL RESEARCH ACT OF 2000

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to send to the desk, on behalf of Senator Harkin and myself, a bill
captioned the `Stem Cell Research Act of 2000.' It is being introduced after a series of four hearings, which have been
conducted in the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education, which I chair and on which
Senator Harkin is the ranking Democrat.

The subject has been a very important one because approximately 15 months ago, there were disclosures about stem cell
research which provided an opportunity for a veritable fountain of youth. The scientific discoveries have found that from the
stem cells, new cells may be created which have the potential to cure a great many severe maladies. For example, on
Parkinson's disease, stem cells are enormously helpful. There is potential for cures on Alzheimer's, on heart ailments, and really
on the whole range of human ailments, illnesses, and diseases.

There has been a limiting factor on the use of stem cells because of a provision, which was inserted many years ago into the
appropriations bill for our subcommittee, which limits Federal funding on research relating to stem cells.

The Department of Health and Human Services has handed down a ruling which would permit federal scientists to conduct
research on stem cells that have been derived by private sources.

The concern has been that the human embryo, subjected to scientific research, would potentially destroy life. The fact is that the
only human embryos which are used as a basis for stem cell research are human embryos from discarded in vitro fertilization
clinics. It is not a matter of using a human embryo which has the potentiality for life to extract the stem cells because these are
embryos which have been discarded.

Notwithstanding the legal opinion handed down by the general counsel of the Department of Health and Human Services, it is
our view that there are still undue restrictions on scientific research from existing law. That is why this legislation has been
introduced. It will eliminate the ban on the use of Federal funding for the research on stem cells.

There are a number of very important restrictions.

First, the research would not apply to the creation of human embryos for research purposes.

Second, the research would not result in the cloning of a human being.

Third, it would be unlawful for any person receiving Federal funds to knowingly acquire, receive, or transfer any human
embryos for valuable consideration, even if the transfer affected interstate commerce.

These limitations have been engrafted into the legislation to be sure this kind of inappropriate conduct is being prohibited.

The legal opinion issued by the Department of Health and Human Services covers the statutory prohibition on the use of funds,
stating that human embryo research would not apply to research utilizing human pluripotent stem cells because such stem cells
do not constitute a human embryo. However, applying the Federal funding solely to pluripotent stem cells is not sufficient
because there ought to be an opportunity for broader research, as I have suggested.

The controversy on stem cell research is very similar to the controversy which had existed on prohibiting research on fetal tissue
when many people advanced the argument that it would induce abortions to secure fetal tissue. It soon became readily apparent
that the research on fetal tissue was from discarded fetal tissue and that, in fact, there would not be an inducement of abortions
to produce fetal tissue for research purposes. That is very similar, almost identical, except for what is involved with the issue of
human embryos. Human embryos which will not be used for research for stem cells where there is any possibility that they
might produce life and may be used only from discarded embryos, similarly to the discarded fetal tissue.

When the appropriations bill was considered last fall, a provision was inserted into the committee report which would eliminate
the prohibition of use of funds for research on stem cells. When it became apparent that this provision would likely stall the
progress of the appropriations bill, an agreement was reached to remove that provision in committee before the bill got to the
floor under an arrangement with our distinguished majority leader, Senator Lott, who agreed to bring up the legislation as a
freestanding bill. That is the legislation Senator Harkin and I are introducing today.

We intend to have an additional hearing within the next several weeks so that the stage will be set by late February or early
March to proceed with the schedule of this bill as a freestanding measure and so that the Senate may vote up or down and the
House of Representatives may ultimately have an opportunity to vote as well.

Over the past 14 months, the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Subcommittee which I chair, held four
hearings, the latest on November 4, 1999, to discuss the advances in stem cell research made by two research teams. One
team, led by Dr. James Thompson at the University of Wisconsin, and the other headed by Dr. John Gearhart at Johns
Hopkins University. Stem cell research is one area that holds particular promise for the development of future medical treatment
and cures. Stem cells originating in an embryo have the unique ability, for a very limited period of time, to become any cell type
of the body. This power, if harnessed by science, could lead to replacement therapies for failing cells, for example, or lead to
organ tissues that could be implanted into a patient. Scientists are just beginning preliminary research into the potential practical
applications of this line of work. At a Senate hearing convened by my subcommittee on December 2, 1998, Dr. Gearhart
testified that he has been able to induce some stem cells to grow into nerve cells. Other scientists also stated that cures for
Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, heart disease, diabetes, and other diseases and illnesses that plague mankind could be greatly

accelerated by stem cell research. Some scientists, for example, believe that stem cell research could lead to tangible benefits to
Parkinson's Disease patients in as soon as 7 to 10 years.

What has been delaying the advancement of this new line of research is a provision in the Labor-HHS appropriations bill that
prohibits research on human embryos. On January 15, 1999, the Department of Health and Human Services issued a legal
opinion finding that the statutory prohibition of the use of funds appropriated to HHS for human embryo research would not
apply to research utilizing human pluripotent stem cells because such cells do not constitute a human embryo. But even this
limited use of stem cells may be blocked by those who misunderstand its purpose. According to Dr. Harold Varmus, the
former head of the National Institutes of Health, research on stem cells is not the same as research on human embryos. Stem
cells do not have the capacity to develop into a human being.

While I applaud the HHS ruling, I do not believe that it goes far enough. To achieve the greatest and swiftest benefits, Federal
researchers need their own supply of stem cells. Therefore, I am proposing this legislation to enable Federally-funded
researchers to derive their own stem cells from spare embryos obtained from in vitro fertilization clinics. Allowing scientists to
conduct human stem cell research would greatly accelerate advances in many avenues of study and, in collaboration with
private industry, expedite the production and availability of new drugs and treatments. Enacting such legislation would clarify the
boundaries governing Federally-funded researchers and make clear the commitment of this Congress to biomedical research.

Let me review the key provisions of this bill:

It would amend the Public Health Service Act and give permanent authority to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to
conduct, support, or fund research on human embryos only for the purpose of generating stem cells. Human embryonic stem
cells may be derived and used in research only from embryos that would otherwise be discarded and donated by in vitro
fertilization clinics and only with the written informed consent of the donors.

The Secretary shall issue guidelines governing human stem cell research, including definitions and terms used in such research.

All Federal research protocols and consent forms involving human pluripotent stem cell research shall be reviewed and
approved by an institutional review board.

The Secretary shall annually submit to the Congress a report describing the activities carried out under this section during the
preceding fiscal year, including whether and to what extent research has been conducted in accordance with this purpose.

The following restrictions would apply:

(A) The research shall not result in the creation of human embryos for research purposes.

(B) The research shall not result in the cloning of a human being.

(C) It shall be unlawful for any person receiving Federal funds to knowingly acquire, receive, or transfer any human embryos
for valuable consideration if the transfer affects interstate commerce.

We have heard very compelling testimony from many individuals who are hoping for treatments and cures from stem cell
research. One individual, Mr. Richard Pikunis of Malvern, New Jersey, a 27 year-old stricken with Parkinson's Disease, told
the Subcommittee how the disease has affected every facet of his young life--from law school graduation to the birth of his son.
Dr. Douglas Melton, a prominent professor at Harvard, told of the struggles of his son afflicted with juvenile diabetes. We also
heard from Michael J. Fox, who implored us to do more for people with Parkinson's disease. Mr. Fox told of his daily
medication routine and progressing physical and mental exhaustion. He asked for the Subcommittee's help to eradicate the
disease so that he could dance at his children's weddings. Mr. Fox has just recently announced that he is leaving his popular
television series to devote more time to his family and to advocate for more research on finding a cure for Parkinson's disease.

Mr. President, these are just a few of the voices pleading with us to allow this research to move ahead. While stem cell
research does not guarantee that a cure will be found, without it the opportunity to halt their suffering may be denied then. The
enactment of this legislation as soon as possible could give thousands of individuals a chance to see a cure within their lifetime.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows: There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Page: S151] GPO's PDF

S . 2015

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the `Stem Cell Research Act of 2000'.

SEC. 2. RESEARCH ON HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS.
Part G of the Title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 288 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 498B the
following:

`SEC. 498C. RESEARCH ON HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS.
`(a) In General: Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may only conduct, support, or fund research on, or
utilizing, human embryos for the purpose of generating embryonic stem cells in accordance with this section.

`(b) Sources of Embryonic Cells: For purposes of carrying out research under paragraph (1), the human embryonic stem
cells involved shall be derived only from embryos that otherwise would be discarded that have been donated from in-vitro
fertilization clinics with the written informed consent of the progenitors.
`(c) Restrictions:

`(1) In general: The following restriction shall apply with respect to human embryonic stem cell research conducted or
supported under subsection (a):

`(A) The research involved shall not result in the creation of human embryos.

`(B) The research involved shall not result in the reproductive cloning of a human being.

`(2) Prohibition:

`(A) In general: It shall be unlawful for any person receiving Federal funds to knowingly acquire, receive, or otherwise transfer
any human gametes or human embryos for valuable consideration if the acquisition, receipt, or transfer affects interstate
commerce.

`(B) Definition: In subparagraph (A), the term `valuable consideration' does not include reasonable payments associated with
transportation, transplantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage.
`(d) Guidelines:

`(1) In general: The Secretary, in conjunction with the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall issue guidelines
governing human embryonic stem cell research under this section, including the definitions and terms used for purposes of such
research.

`(2) Requirements: The guidelines issued under paragraph (1) shall ensure that--

`(A) all Federal research protocols and consent forms involving human embryonic stem cell research must be reviewed and
approved by an institutional review board; and

`(B) the institutional review board is empowered to make a determination as to whether or not the proposed research is in
accordance with National Institutes of Health Guidelines for Research Involving Human Pluripotent Stem Cells.
`(e) Reporting Requirements.: Not later than January 1 2001, and each January 1 thereafter, the Secretary shall prepare and
submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the activities carried out under this section during the
preceding fiscal year, and including a description of whether and to what extent research under subsection (a) has been
conducted in accordance with this section.'.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague, Senator Specter, in the introduction of the
`Stem Cell Research Act of 2000.' I want to commend Senator Specter for having the leadership and foresight to introduce

legislation which will broaden federally-funded scientists to pursue stem cell research, under certain, limited conditions.

From enabling the development of cell and tissue transplantation, to improving and accelerating pharmaceutical research and development, to increasing our understanding of human development and cancer biology, the potential benefits of stem cell research are truly awe-inspiring.

Stem cells hold hope for countless patients through potentially lifesaving therapies for Parkinson's, Alzheimers, stroke, heart disease and diabetes. Also exciting is the possibility that researchers may be able to alter stem cells genetically so they would avoid attack by the patient's immune system.

But all of these potential benefits could be delayed or even denied to patients without a healthy partnership between the private sector and the federal government.

While market interest in stem cell technology is strong, and private companies will continue to fund this research, the government has an important role to play in supporting the basic and applied science that underpins these technologies. The problem is that early, basic science is always going to be underfunded by the private sector because this type of research does not get products onto the market quickly enough. The only way to ensure that this research is conducted is to allow the NIH to support it.

The Department of Health and Human Services ruled last year that under the current ban on human embryo research, federally-funded scientists can conduct stem cell research if they use cell lines derived from private sources. This is a positive step forward, but it continues to handicap our researchers in the pursuit of cures and therapies that will help our citizens,

Last fall, the National Bioethics Advisory Commission (NBAC) released its final report, `Ethical Issues in Human Stem Cell Research.' The Commission concluded that stem cell research should be allowed to go forward with federal support, as long as researchers were limited to only two sources of stem cells: fetal tissue and embryos resulting from infertility treatments. And they recommended that federal support be contingent on an open system of oversight and review.

NBAC also arrived at the important conclusion that it is ethically acceptable for the federal government to finance research that both derives cell lines from embryos and that uses those cell lines. Their report states, `Relying on cell lines that might be derived exclusively by a subset of privately funded researchers who are interested in this area could severely limit scientific and clinical progress.'

The Commission goes on to say that `scientists who conduct basic research and are interested in fundamental cellular processes are likely to make elemental discoveries about the nature of ES [embryonic stem] cells as they derive them in the laboratory.'

NBAC's report presents reasonable guidelines for federal policy. Our bill bans human embryo research, but allows
federally-funded scientists to derive human pluripotent stem cells from human embryos if those embryos are obtained from IVF
clinics, if the donor has provided informed consent and the embryo was no longer needed for fertility treatments. The American
Society of Cell Biology estimates that 100,000 human embryos are currently frozen in IVF clinics, in excess of their clinical
need.

In addition, our language requires HHS and NIH to develop procedural and ethical guidelines to make sure that stem cell
research is conducted in an ethical, sound manner. As it stands today, stem cell research in the private sector is not subject to
federal monitoring or ethical requirements.

Stem cell research holds such hope, such potential for millions of Americans who are sick and in pain, it is morally wrong for us
to prevent or delay our world-class scientists from building on the progress that has been made.

As long as this research is conducted in an ethically validated manner, it should be allowed to go forward, and it should receive
federal support. That is why Senator Specter and I have joined together on legislation that will allow our nation's top scientists
to pursue critical cures and therapies for the diseases and chronic conditions which strike too many Americans. I urge my
Senate colleagues to join us in supporting this bill.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-2000 10:16:37.00

SUBJECT: FW: UW announces institute that will sell stem cells

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: Tanner, Rob (OD)
Sent: Wednesday, February 02, 2000 10:17 AM
To: 'Eiseman,Elisa(NBAC)'; Gadbois, Ellen; Kim, Stuart; Lee, Kerry Jo;
McCurry, Debra; Meslin, Eric; 'Moreno, Jonathan'; Page, Alice; 'Speers, Marjorie'
Subject: UW announces institute that will sell stem cells
Sensitivity: Personal

UW announces institute that will sell stem cells

By John Fauber
of the Journal Sentinel staff

Last Updated: Feb. 2, 2000

The University of Wisconsin-Madison announced Tuesday it is
creating a new institute that it says will
be the first to sell embryonic stem cells for worldwide research that could lead to cures for ailments
ranging from heart disease to Parkinson's.

The university said the WiCell Research Institute will be a
non-profit, private subsidiary of the

Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation.

"The intent is to get them out into the world so that good things can be done with them," said UW biologist James Thomson, who will be WiCell's scientific director.

UW scientists already have more than 100 requests from researchers who want to be supplied by the institute.

Embryonic stem cells are the parent cells for all the tissues and organs in the body. Such research holds great promise because the cells eventually might be directed to repair or grow replacements for human hearts, livers and other organs as well as brain, blood and muscle cells.

In November 1998, Thomson and other UW scientists announced that they had become the first to isolate and grow embryonic stem cells in the lab. The cells were derived from leftover embryos donated from infertility clinics. UW has a patented process that keeps the cells dividing without differentiating into different body tissues. As a result, researchers don't need more embryos.

WiCell plans to offer five lines of stem cells, originally derived from five embryos.

"There is huge potential in these," Thomson said in an interview Tuesday. "And the quicker researchers get access to them, the faster important therapies will be developed."

But the demand for UW's cells is tied to a larger debate over the use of embryonic stem cells.

In December, the National Institutes of Health announced proposed new rules for embryonic stem cell research that is funded with federal money. The guidelines continue to ban human cloning from stem

cells or adding them to human embryos, but allow most other types of research to proceed.

But the guidelines have not been finalized, and Congress may weigh in on the issue.

Without guidelines, researchers who receive federal funding are limited in being able to do stem cell research. Because of such limits and their effect on the UW lab, a private entity was established, Thomson said.

Demand for the UW stem cells will be "modest" until the new guidelines are final, Thomson said. But once the guidelines are in place, probably later this year, the demand should be substantial, he said.

Scientists who want to use the UW cells must sign a licensing agreement prohibiting them from using the cells for human cloning or for intermingling the cells with intact embryos.

Appeared in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel on Feb. 2, 2000.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Katharine_Moore@dpc.senate.gov (Katharine Moore) (Katharine_Moore@dpc.senate.gov (Katharine Moore) [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:18-FEB-2000 16:24:58.00

SUBJECT: DPC Daily Report -Tuesday, February 22, 2000

TO: DPCDAILY_Mailing_List@dpc.senate.gov (DPCDAILY Mailing List) (DPCDAILY_Mailing_List@dpc.senate.gov (DPCDAILY Mailing List) [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

DPC Daily Report Tuesday, February 22, 2000

TODAY'S SENATE FLOOR SCHEDULE

The Senate will convene at 11 a.m., with Senator Moynihan delivering President Washington's Farewell Address. Following the address, there will be a period for morning business until 12:30 p.m. Senator Durbin is in control of the first half of the time, and Senator Thomas controls the second half.

The Senate will recess from 12:30-2:15 p.m., for the weekly party conferences.

At 2:30 p.m., the Senate may begin consideration of any Executive or Legislative Calendar items cleared for action.

RECENT SENATE FLOOR HIGHLIGHTS

On Thursday, February 10, the Senate passed:

* S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste bill, 64-34.

In other Senate business, by unanimous consent the Senate agreed to:

* S. Res. 256, designating the week of February 14-18, 2000, as "National Heart Failure Awareness Week;" and

* H. Con Res. 244, permitting the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

DEMOCRATIC DAYBOOK

* DPC Lunch

Time: 12:30-2 p.m.
Date: Thursday, February 24
Place: LBJ Room, S-211 in the Capitol

Lana Skirboll, Ph.D., associate director for Science Policy, National Institutes of Health; and James Childress, Ph.D., professor of religious studies, University of Virginia, will discuss the medical and ethical issues surrounding stem cell research.

Please RSVP for this Senators only event so that lunch orders may be placed.

DPC staff contact: Jeff Mitchell, 4-3232.

TODAY'S HOUSE SCHEDULE

The House is in recess for a home district work week.

ADMINISTRATION EVENTS

* President Clinton will host a health care quality event at the White House in the afternoon.

* First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton will travel to New York and remain until Wednesday, February 23.

IN TOWN THIS WEEK

* National Press Club Newsmaker Luncheon Program

Time: 12 noon
Date: Today, Tuesday, February 22
Place: National Press Club,
14th and F Sts., NW.

Sen. Joseph Lieberman will participate in a discussion on defending public service at a time when America's regard for it is at an all time low.

For more information, call (212) 698-7277

* Book Discussion

Time: 7 p.m.
Date: Today, Tuesday, February 22

Place: Politics and Prose Bookstore,
5015 Connecticut Ave., NW.

Senator Joseph Lieberman will discuss his recently-published book, "In Praise of Public Life."

For information, call (202) 364-1919

* National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) "Executive Council Winter Session."

Date: February 23-26
Place: Grand Hyatt Hotel, 1000 H St., NW.

Senator Byron Dorgan is scheduled to address the executive council at 9:15 a.m. on Thursday, February 24.

For more information, call (202)466-7767 or see: http://www.ncai.org/NCAICalander/ncaievents2000.htm

* Dialogue on Diversity, Annual Meeting

Date: Today, Tuesday, February 22, 2000
Place: Washington, DC

For more information, call (703) 631-0650 or see http://www.dialogueondiversity.org/events_p4.html.

* Dialogue on Diversity, Public Policy Symposium "The First Two Thousand Years are the Hardest"

Time: 8 a.m.-2 p.m.
Date: Tomorrow, February 23, 2000
Place: Cannon HOB

For more information, call (703) 631-0650 or see http://www.dialogueondiversity.org/events_p4.html.

ECONOMIC INDICATORS

* The Department of Commerce will issue its preliminary 1999 4th quarter Gross Domestic Product estimate on Friday, February 25.

FROM THE DPC

* February Recess Packet

The following DPC documents, which were distributed in the February Recess Packet, are available on

Demster and in SH-512:

A pocket card, "Families First : The 2000 Democratic Agenda;"

A report, "Families First: The 2000 Agenda;"

DPC Fact Sheet, "The 2000 Democratic Agenda: Safer Communities and Schools;"

DPC Fact Sheet, "The 2000 Democratic Agenda: A Responsible Budget;"

DPC Fact Sheet, "The 2000 Democratic Agenda: Access to Quality Education;"

DPC Fact Sheet, "The 2000 Democratic Agenda: Access to Quality Health Care;"

DPC documents may be downloaded from the intranet at:

http://demster.senate.gov/pubs.htm

As soon as DPC publications are obtainable, their availability will be announced by e-mail.

BILLS INTRODUCED RECENTLY

S.CON.RES.80: A concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives. Sponsor: Sen. Trent Lott. 2/10, passed House.

S.CON.RES.81: A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government of the People's Republic of China should immediately release Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and her son, and permit them to move to the United States if they so desire. Sponsor: Sen. William V. Roth, Jr. 2/10, referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Cmte.

S.RES.255: A resolution recognizing and honoring Bob Collins, and expressing the condolences of the Senate to his family on his death. Sponsor: Sen. Richard J. Durbin. 2/9, passed Senate.

S.RES.256: A resolution designating the week of February 14-18, 2000, as "National Heart Failure Awareness Week". Sponsor: Sen. Arlen Specter. 2/10, passed Senate.

S.RES.257: A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the responsibility of the United States to ensure that the Panama Canal will remain open and secure to vessels of all nations. Sponsor: Sen. Larry E. Craig. 2/10, referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Cmte.

S.RES.258: A resolution designating the week beginning March 12, 2000 as "National Safe Place Week." Sponsor: Sen. Larry E. Craig. 2/10, referred to the Senate Judiciary Cmte.

S. 2042: A bill to reform the process by which the Office of the Pardon Attorney investigates and reviews potential exercises of executive clemency. Sponsor: Sen. Orrin G. Hatch. 2/9, referred to the Senate Judiciary Cmte.

S. 2043: A bill to designate the United States Post Office building located at 3101 West Sunflower Avenue in Santa Ana, CA. Sponsor: Sen. Dianne Feinstein. 2/9, referred to the Senate Governmental Affairs Cmte.

S. 2044: A bill to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for domestic violence programs through the voluntary purchase of specially issued postage stamps. Sponsor: Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell. 2/9, referred to the Senate Governmental Affairs Cmte.

S. 2045: A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to H-1B non-immigrant aliens. Sponsor: Sen. Orrin G. Hatch. 2/9, referred to the Senate Judiciary Cmte.

S. 2046: A bill to reauthorize the Next Generation Internet Act, and for other purposes. Sponsor: Sen. Bill Frist. 2/9, referred to the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Cmte.

S. 2047: A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to create a Heating Oil Reserve to be available for use when fuel oil prices in the United States rise sharply because of anti-competitive activity, during a fuel oil shortage, or during periods of extreme winter weather. Sponsor: Sen. Christopher J. Dodd. 2/9, referred to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Cmte.

S. 2048: A bill to establish the San Rafael Western Legacy District in the State of Utah, and for other purposes. Sponsor: Sen. Orrin G. Hatch. 2/9, referred to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources

Cmte.

S. 2049: A bill to extend the authorization for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund. Sponsor: Sen. Joseph R. Biden, Jr. 2/9, referred to the Senate Judiciary Cmte.

S. 2050: A bill to establish a panel to investigate illegal gambling on college sports and to recommend effective countermeasures to combat this serious national problem. Sponsor: Sen. Harry M. Reid. 2/9, referred to the Senate Judiciary Cmte.

S. 2051: A bill to revise the boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and for other purposes. Sponsor: Sen. Dianne Feinstein. 2/10, referred to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Cmte.

S. 2052: A bill to establish a demonstration project to authorize the integration and coordination of Federal funding dedicated to community, business, and the economic development of Native American communities. Sponsor: Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell. 2/10, referred to the Senate Indian Affairs Cmte.

S. 2053: A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide marriage tax penalty relief for earned income credit. Sponsor: Sen. James M. Jeffords. 2/10, referred to the Senate Finance Cmte.

S. 2054: A bill for the relief of Sandra J. Pilot. Sponsor: Sen. Connie Mack. 2/10, referred to the Senate Judiciary Cmte.

S. 2055: A bill to establish the Katie Poirier Abduction Emergency Fund, and for other purposes. Sponsor: Sen. Paul D. Wellstone. 2/10, referred to the Senate Judiciary Cmte.

S. 2056: A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to ensure an adequate level of commodity purchases under the school lunch program. Sponsor: Sen. Tim Johnson. 2/10, referred to the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Cmte.

S. 2057: A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the use of electronic measurement units (EMUs). Sponsor: Sen. Frank H. Murkowski. 2/10, referred to the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Cmte. S. 2058: A bill to extend filing deadlines for applications for adjustment

of status of certain Cuban, Nicaraguan, and Haitian nationals. Sponsor: Sen. Bob Graham. 2/10, referred to the Senate Judiciary Cmte.

S. 2059: A bill to modify land conveyance authority relating to the former Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Cecil County, Maryland, and for other purposes. Sponsor: Sen. Paul S. Sarbanes. 2/10, referred to the Senate Armed Services Cmte.

S. 2060: A bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world, and for other purposes. Sponsor: Sen. Dianne Feinstein. 2/10, referred to the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Cmte.

S. 2061: A bill to establish a crime prevention and computer education initiative. Sponsor: Sen. Joseph R. Biden, Jr. 2/10, referred to the Senate Judiciary Cmte.

S. 2062: A bill to amend chapter 4 of title 39, United States Code, to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for organ and tissue donation awareness through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps. Sponsor: Sen. Michael DeWine. 2/10, referred to: the Senate Governmental Affairs Cmte.

S. 2063: A bill to amend title 18, United States code, to provide for the applicability to operators of Internet Web sites of restrictions on the disclosure or records and other information relating to the use of such sites, and for other purposes. Sponsor: Sen. Robert G. Torricelli. 2/10, referred to the Senate Judiciary Cmte.

S. 2064: A bill to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, to expand the purpose of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children to cover individuals who are at least 18 but have not yet attained the age of 22. Sponsor: Sen. John Edwards. 2/10, referred to the Senate Judiciary Cmte. S. 2065: A bill to authorize the Attorney General to provide grants for organizations to find missing adults. Sponsor: Sen. John Edwards. 2/10, referred to the Senate Judiciary Cmte.

S. 2066: A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude United States savings bond income from gross income if used to pay long-term care expenses. Sponsor: Sen. Max Cleland. 2/10, referred

to the Senate Finance Cmte.

S. 2067: A bill to provide education and training for the information age. Sponsor: Sen. Bill Frist. 2/10, referred to the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Cmte.

S. 2068: A bill to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from establishing rules authorizing the operation of new,low-power FM radio stations. Sponsor: Sen. Judd Gregg. 2/10, referred to the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Cmte.

S. 2069: A bill to permit the conveyance of certain land in Powell, Wyoming. Sponsor: Sen. Michael B. Enzi. 2/10 referred to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Cmte.

S. 2070: A bill to improve safety standards for child restraints in motor vehicles. Sponsor: Sen. Peter G. Fitzgerald. 2/10, referred to the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Cmte.

S. 2071: A bill to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system. Sponsor: Sen. Slade Gorton. 2/10, referred to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Cmte.

S. 2072: A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to report to Congress on the readiness of the heating oil and propane industries. Sponsor: Sen. John F. Kerry. 2/10, referred to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Cmte.

S. 2073: A bill to reduce the risk that innocent persons may be executed, and for other purposes. Sponsor: Sen. Patrick J. Leahy. 2/10, referred to the Senate Judiciary Cmte.

NOTE: If you would like your name added to or deleted from the e mail list for the DPC Daily Report, please call Jeff Mitchell at 4-3232 or e-mail him at: Jeff Mitchell @ DPC.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Marguerite_Beck-Rex@dpc.senate.gov (Marguerite Beck-Rex) (Marguerite_Beck-Rex@dpc.senate.gov (Marguerite Beck-Rex) [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-FEB-2000 20:48:02.00

SUBJECT: DPC Daily Report - Wednesday, February 23, 2000

TO: DPCDAILY_Mailing_List@dpc.senate.gov (DPCDAILY Mailing List) (DPCDAILY_Mailing_List@dpc.senate.gov (DPCDAILY Mailing List) [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

DPC Daily Report Wednesday, February 23, 2000

TODAY'S SENATE FLOOR SCHEDULE

Today, the Senate will convene at 10 a.m., with a period for morning business until 11:30 a.m., with 45 minutes under the control of Senator Daschle or his designee, and 45 minutes under the control of Senator Thomas or his designee.

At 11:30 a.m., the Senate may turn to the consideration of any available legislation including S. 1134, the Education Savings Account bill, or S. 92, the Biennial Budgeting and Appropriations Act. Roll call votes are possible today.

A roll call vote on passage of H.R. 1883, the Iran Nonproliferation bill, will occur at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, February 24.

RECENT SENATE FLOOR HIGHLIGHTS

Yesterday, the Senate considered H.R. 1833, the Iran Nonproliferation Act. There were no roll call votes.

UPDATES TO TODAY'S COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Information about these hearings was not available for inclusion when the DPC Weekly was prepared last Friday.

* Cyber-Threats

Joint Economic Cmte: examination of cyber-threats to the U.S. economy. 9:30 a.m., SD-562.

* China and the World Trade Organization

Finance Cmte: examination of the U.S.-China Bilateral

Trade Agreement regarding China's accession to the World Trade Organization. 9:30 a.m., SD-215.

DEMOCRATIC DAYBOOK

* DPC Lunch

Topic: Stem Cell Research

Time: 12:30-2 p.m.
Date: Thursday, Feb. 24
Place: LBJ Room, S-211 in the Capitol

Lana Skirboll, Ph.D., associate director for science policy, National Institutes of Health, and James Childress, Ph.D., professor of religious studies, University of Virginia, will discuss the medical and ethical issues surrounding stem cell research.

Please RSVP for this Senators-only event so that lunch orders may be placed.

DPC staff contact: Jeff Mitchell, 4-3232.

TODAY'S HOUSE SCHEDULE

The House is in recess for a home district work week.

ADMINISTRATION EVENTS

President Clinton and First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton will host an arrival ceremony for King Juan Carlos I and Queen Sofia of Spain. In the evening, the President and First Lady will host a State dinner for King Juan Carlos and Queen Sofia.

Vice President Gore will be in Boca Raton, FL; DC; and Westchester County, NY.

IN TOWN THIS WEEK

* National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) Executive Council Winter Session.

Date: Today, Feb. 23, through Saturday, Feb. 26
Place: Grand Hyatt Hotel, 1000 H St., NW.

On Thursday, Feb. 24, Senator Byron Dorgan will speak to the NCAI executive council at 9:15 a.m.

On Friday, Feb. 25, Senator Tom Daschle will address the NCAI council at 1:30 p.m.

For more information, call (202)466-7767 or see: http://www.ncai.org/NCAICalander/ncaievents2000.htm

---

ECONOMIC INDICATORS

The Department of Commerce will issue its preliminary 1999 4th quarter Gross Domestic Product estimate on Friday, February 25.

FROM THE DPC

A DPC Legislative Bulletin on H.R. 1833, the Iran Nonproliferation Act (LB-58-Defense), is available on Demster and in SH-512.

A Legislative Bulletin on S 92, the Biennial Budgeting and Appropriations Act (LB-59-Budget), also is available on Demster and in SH-512.

Both will be delivered by inside mail today.

DPC documents may be downloaded from the intranet at:

http://demster.senate.gov/pubs.htm

As soon as DPC publications are obtainable, their availability will be announced by e-mail.

NOTE: If you would like your name added to or deleted from the e-mail list for the DPC Daily Report, please call Jeff Mitchell at 4-3232 or e-mail him at: Jeff Mitchell @ DPC.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Katharine_Moore@dpc.senate.gov (Katharine Moore) (Katharine_Moore@dpc.senate.gov (Katharine Moore) [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-FEB-2000 18:57:42.00

SUBJECT: DPC Daily - Thursday, February 24, 2000

TO: DPCDAILY_Mailing_List@dpc.senate.gov (DPCDAILY Mailing List) (DPCDAILY_Mailing_List@dpc.senate.gov (DPCDAILY Mailing List) [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

DPC Daily Report Thursday, February 24, 2000

TODAY'S SENATE FLOOR SCHEDULE

The Senate will convene today at 11:30 a.m., with a roll call vote on final passage of H.R. 1883, the Iran Nonproliferation bill.

Following this roll call vote, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1134, the Education Savings Accounts bill. No agreement has been reached regarding consideration of the bill.

RECENT SENATE FLOOR HIGHLIGHTS

Yesterday, the Senate debated S. 1134, the Education Savings Account bill.

There were no roll call votes.

UPDATES TO TODAY'S COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Information about the following hearings was not available for inclusion when the DPC Weekly was prepared last Friday:

* Armed Services Cmte: discuss export controls. 9:30 a.m., SR 222.

* Finance Cmte: discuss Medicare reform. Witness: comptroller general David Walker. 10 a.m., SD-215.

* African Affairs Subcmte: examine the AIDS crisis in Africa. Witnesses: Senators John Kerry, Barbara

Boxer, and Richard Durbin; Surgeon General David Satcher; and Sandra Thurman, director, Office of National AIDS policy. 2:30 p.m., SD-419.

NEW

* Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Cmte: discuss nominations of Dr. Kathryn Shaw (PA), to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisors; and Hon. J. W. Johnson (WI), to be Director of the Mint at the Department of Treasury. 2 p.m., SD-628.

DEMOCRATIC DAYBOOK

* DPC Lunch

Topic: Stem Cell Research

Time: 12:30-2 p.m.
Date: Today, Thursday, Feb. 24
Place: LBJ Room, S-211 in the Capitol

Lana Skirboll, Ph.D., associate director for science policy, National Institutes of Health, and James Childress, Ph.D., professor of religious studies, University of Virginia, will discuss the medical and ethical issues surrounding stem cell research.

DPC staff contact: Jeff Mitchell, 4-3232.

TODAY'S HOUSE SCHEDULE

The House is in recess for a home district work week.

ADMINISTRATION EVENTS

* President Clinton will travel to Philadelphia, PA, where he will deliver the Granoff lecture at the University of Pennsylvania. In the evening, the President will travel to New York, NY.

IN TOWN

* National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) Executive Council Winter Session.

Date: Today, Feb. 24, through Saturday, Feb. 26
Place: Grand Hyatt Hotel, 1000 H St., NW.

Today, Thursday, Feb. 24, Senator Byron Dorgan will

speak to the NCAI executive council at 9:15 a.m.

Tomorrow, Friday, Feb. 25, Senator Tom Daschle will address the NCAI executive council at 1:30 p.m.

For more information, call (202)466-7767 or see: http://www.ncai.org/NCAICalander/ncaievents2000.htm

---

ECONOMIC INDICATORS

* The Department of Commerce will issue its preliminary 1999 4th quarter Gross Domestic Product estimate tomorrow, Friday, February 25.

FROM THE DPC

* Education

DPC Legislative Bulletin, S. 1134, the Affordable Education Act of 1999. (LB-60-Education)

DPC Legislative Bulletin, S. 1134, the Affordable Education Act of 1999, Supplement A, Possible Amendments. (LB-60-Education)

Both documents are available on Demster and in SH-512. They also will be delivered today by inside mail.

DPC documents may be downloaded from the intranet at:

http://demster.senate.gov/pubs.htm

As soon as DPC publications are obtainable, their availability will be announced by e-mail.

BILLS INTRODUCED RECENTLY

S. 2074: A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the social security earnings test for individuals who have attained retirement age. Sponsor: Sen. John Ashcroft. 2/22, referred to the Senate Finance Cmte.

S. 2075: A bill to expand Federal employee commuting options and to reduce the traffic congestion resulting from current Federal employee commuting patterns, and for other purposes. Sponsor: Sen. Charles S. Robb. 2/22, referred to the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Cmte.

S. 2076: A bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to John Cardinal O' Connor, Archbishop of New York, in recognition of his accomplishments as a priest, a chaplain, and a humanitarian. Sponsor: Sen. Charles Schumer. 2/22, referred to the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Cmte.

S. 2077: A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow nonitemizers a deduction for a portion of their charitable contributions. Sponsor: Sen. Rick Santorum. 2/22, referred to the Senate Finance Cmte.

S. 2078: A bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Muhammad Ali in recognition of his outstanding athletic accomplishments and enduring contributions to humanity, and for other purposes. Sponsor: Sen. Jim Bunning, 2/22 referred to the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Cmte.

S. 2079: A bill to facilitate the timely resolution of backlogged civil rights discrimination cases of the department of Agriculture, and for other purposes. Sponsor: Sen. Conrad R. Burns. 2/22, referred to the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Cmte.

S. 2080: A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that food that contains a genetically engineered material, or that is produced with a genetically engineered material, must be labeled accordingly, and for other purposes. Sponsor: Sen. Barbara Boxer. 2/22, referred to the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Cmte.

S. 2081: A bill entitled Religious Liberty Protection Act of 2000". Sponsor: Sen. Orrin G. Hatch. 2/22, Senate preparation for floor.

S. 2082: A bill to establish a program to award grants to improve and maintain sites honoring Presidents of the United States. Sponsor: Sen. Michael DeWine. 2/22, referred to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Cmte.

S. 2083: A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a uniform dollar limitation for all types of transportation fringe benefits excludable from gross income, and for other

purposes. Sponsor: Sen. Charles S. Robb. 2/22, referred to the Senate Finance Cmte.

S. 2084: A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the charitable deduction allowable for contributions of food inventory, and for other purposes. Sponsor: Sen. Richard G. Lugar. 2/22, referred to the Senate Finance Cmte.

S. 2085: A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for older Americans to remain in the workforce beyond the age of eligibility for full social security benefits. Sponsor: Sen. Richard G. Lugar. 2/22, referred to the Senate Finance Cmte.

S. 2086: A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for older Americans to remain in the workforce beyond the age of eligibility for full social security benefits. Sponsor: Sen. Richard G. Lugar. 2/22, referred to the Senate Finance Cmte.

NOTE: If you would like your name added to or deleted from the e mail list for the DPC Daily Report, please call Jeff Mitchell at 4-3232 or e-mail him at: Jeff Mitchell @ DPC.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-FEB-2000 17:03:13.00

SUBJECT: FW: ES research regulation policy in Japan

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

TEXT:
Attached please find an abstract from a colleague of mine in Japan who notes
that the new Japanese policy regarding stem cell research is based upon NBAC's
report.

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: jiron@libra.ls.m-kagaku.co.jp
[SMTP:jiron@libra.ls.m-kagaku.co.jp]
Sent: Friday, February 25, 2000 6:34 AM
To: Meslin, Eric (OD)
Subject: ES research regulation policy in Japan

Dear Eric,

How are you?

You may have read a news article about stem cell research policy in Japan in the "Nature" February 3 issue at p470. I find it well hitting the point.

Please find attached the abstract of my presentation for a symposium held by the Institute of Medical Sciences of the University of Tokyo in coming June. It summarizes the Japanese policy and my analysis.
I would be happy if it could be of use for your further reference.

Best regards,

Jiro Nudeshima

********attached**********

IMSUT Symposium for Stem Cell Research June 22-24, 2000 Presentation Abstract

Session(8)Bioethics

Title; Characteristics of policy-making for stem cell research regulation in Japan

Jiro NUDESHIMA, Ph.D.
Senior Researcher, Life Science & Society Programme
Mitsubishi Kasei Institute of Life Sciences

The Japanese Council for Science & Technology(CST), an advisory body to the Prime Minister, is about to authorise the Government to fund human stem cell research using surplus embryos in infertility clinics for the fiscal year 2000. This policy is based on a report by the National Bioethics Commission(NBC) belonging to the CST in March 2000.

This report recommended three-tier-divided policy for regulating human embryo research; 1)embryonic stem cell research should be regulated by administrative guidelines, 2)research involving nuclear transfer should be regulated by legally mandated statutes, 3)all other human embryo research, most of which are those in reproductive medicine, including, for example, embryo biopsy research for preimplantation genetic diagnosis and fertilisation research using spermatozoa cultivated in mice, are left to self-judgement of medical societies and research institutions, partly based on professional guidelines, without any public regulation nor disciplinary sanction.

In Japan, there is no public rules for protection of human subject in research, except for the Good Clinical Practice for trials of new drugs for market approval. There is no public protection of human embryo and fetus as research subject, either. Japan will be the first nation among developped countries to authorise human embryonic stem cell research without any regulation for human embryo research at large.

Not only from the whole human embryo research, the stem cell research policy in Japan is also separated from that of human reproductive technology. No public regulation exists on assisted reproductive technologies in Japan.There are only voluntary guidelines issued by the Japan Society of Obstetrics, which don't allow to donate surplus embryo to other infertile couple. Given this situation, can it be ethically justifiable to ask those same people to donate their embryos solely for research quite unrelated to their condition? Coordination and integration of policy making for stem cell research, human embryo research and reproductive technology regulations are needed. In the subcommittee drafting the NBC report on stem cell research, I repeatedly argued that such integration was indispensable, but it was not dealt with in the final report.

These characteristics of the Japanese stem cell research regulation require to pay attention to two factors; one is the Japanese public attitude toward

the issue of moral or legal status of human embryo. People pay little attention, rather indifferent, to this issue. The other is the political-administrative structure, which obstructs comprehensive policy-making on life sciences and medicine. In my presentation, I'd like to show those two as causal factors limiting the scope of stem cell research regulation policy in Japan.

Jiro NUDESHIMA
Mitsubishi Kasei Institute of Life Sciences,
11, Minami-Ooya , Machida-shi, Tokyo 194, Japan
Tel: (81) 427-24-6280
Fax: (81) 427-24-6301
email : jiron@libra.ls.m-kagaku.co.jp

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Gregory Aharonian <srctran@world.std.com> (Gregory Aharonian <srctran@world.std.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-MAR-2000 04:02:54.00

SUBJECT: PATNEWS: Critique of the Pope's apology to the world

TO: patent-news@world.std.com (patent-news@world.std.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
!20000327 Critique of the Pope's apology to the world

[News note: today's Science magazine reports that India has fully eradicated
a second disease, Guinea worm. 50 years ago, upwards of 25 million Indians suffered from this disease (imagine a footlong skinny worm in your leg). WHO is hoping that by the year 2010 the entire world will be rid of the Guinea worm.]

[News note: Newswires report that 1500 people held a protest march in Boston outside Bio2000, a gathering of 7000 biotechnologists from around the world. In contrast, AgBioWorld.com reports that 2000 scientists from around the world signed a "Declaration in Support of Agricultural Biotechnology".]

====

A few weeks ago, the Pope apologized to the world for the crimes and horrors committed by Catholics in the last two thousand years, broadly lumped into seven categories: crimes against Christian unity, crimes against Jews, crimes against other religions and cultures, crimes against women and the unity of the human race, crimes against individual rights, and crimes in generals (and crimes these acts were, not just sins).

In general, the media coverage was shoddy, barely even analyzing the inconsistencies in the apology and church policy, let alone recounting specifics of the history of the crimes committed. Consider the cute phrase "sins committed in the service of truth" - public relations experts are drooling with envy in penning such an oblique way of referring to the murders, genocides and cultural destructions of the Crusades, Inquisitions, European holy wars, burning of heretics, forced conversion and destruction of Indian and African societies, etc. But that's for the historians and lawyers to deal with in the future.

What the biotechnology world should be concerned about (a world driven much by patents, making the apology enough of a patent issue for this PATNEWS) is the theme of one apology. Part of each apology was read by a Catholic Cardinal, followed by a part read by the Pope. At one point in the service, Cardinal Xavier Nguyen Van gave an apology to "minors who are victims of abuse [and] the unborn killed in their mother's womb or even

exploited for experimental purposes by those who abuse the promise of biotechnology." Pass that around on a flyer at BIO2000 this week.

Those of you involved with (the patenting of) embryonic stem cell research should find this apology, not of a past Catholic Church action, but rather a past Church inaction (i.e. not doing more to protect embryos and fetuses), very troubling. It equates anti-abortion activities with anti-stemcell activities, so those of you who think recent protests by anti-abortionists against stemcell companies in Silicon Valley were isolated transient activities, you are wrong. They are just a harbinger of things to come, now with blessings of the Church for Catholics in their ranks. It doesn't matter that terms such as "unborn child" and "life starts at conception" are scientifically meaningless terms (read Clifford Grobstein to understand why), such activities against the supposedly unethical activities of the biotechnology industry now have the tacit approval of the Church, which also influences the minds of Catholic voters and Catholic Congressmen when it comes to passing legislation and approving budgets for stem cell research and any future biotech patent legislation (for example, a congressional hearing March 9th on fetal tissue sales).

Of course, it doesn't help that the biotechnology industry doesn't care much about these non-scientific issues, presumably hoping that they will all go away so that they can focus on making money without having to have their energies diverted by issues of social responsibility. An article in Boston Sunday Globe best summarizes this apathy:

> "Looking at the program, one would think that organizers had failed to read newspapers during the past years. Topics that have recently kept biotechnology in the spotlight in the United States and much of the rest of the world are almost completely absent from the conference sessions and symposiums.
>
> No mention is made of controversies over genetically modified organisms, patenting of compounds derived from local resources, use of indigeneous knowledge without appropriate benefit sharing, cloning and cross-species transplantation, or experimental gene therapies halted by the Food and Drug Administration in recent months."

This apathy is situational ethics that probably will be apologized for in the decades to come, though thanks to the Pope's apology there is irony in religious attacks on such scientific moral relativism and situational ethics in the pursuit of profits. As a writer (John Leo, March 27) in US News & World Report noted ironically:

> Referring to the Crusades and the Inquisition, the document [the formal apology document was titled 'Memory and Reconciliation'] says: "Isn't it a bit too easy to judge people of the past by the conscience of today . . . almost as if moral conscience were not situated in time?" Correct answer: No. Many of the valiant crusaders used to warm up for their long trip to the Holy Land by butchering some local Jews, just for practice. The Christian moral conscience should have judged acts like these just as clearly in 1099 as the pope and most of the world would today. Yes, some moral

> norms change over time, but Catholics are not famous for their belief in moral and cultural relativism. An unsuspected respect for relativism really shouldn't show up in the middle of a confession for the Crusades and the Inquisition.

or a similar skepticism from Leon Wieseltier writing last week in the New Republic:

> "The outrages to which the pope refers were the direct consequence of the church's holy alliance with the state, and it is worth recalling that it was modern politics, liberal politics, secular politics, and not anything that the church said or did, that dissolved this unholy association of religion and power".

As well as the unholy denial of the right of women to vote.

==========

The pope repeatedly makes the distinction between the crimes and sins of Catholics from parishioners to popes, versus the purity of the Church itself. A dualism I have never understood, that from the purity of the Church (i.e. the Bible as the word of God), using (weak) reason and faith, one can justify horrors and crimes.

So let's ignore most of the Church, and focus on what has to be the most holy part of the Church, the popes. Harder to ignore their crimes, since they have some direct spiritual connection back to Christ through the first Pope (Saint Peter). Everyone else can be excused that they were just following orders, but not so the popes. It was their orders and their divine inspiration that lead to the crimes that this pope is now apologizing
for. And a spiritual connection that gives this pope, and the next final two (an oblique reference to a prediction made centuries ago), the supposed right to question the ethics and activities of the biotechnology industry.

So how do we focus on the popes (and how should have the press like the Journal and Times focussed on the popes - they need better religion reporters)? While there are many ways to do so, what follows are accounts from a variety of history books of some crimes and horrors committed by the popes themselves (an account that would have made a nice table in the Journal or Times). The question is, does a pope as the end of a chain of MEN with this history have the right to meddle in the ethics of the scientific world (and much the same of the leaders of the Protestant hierarchies as well), given such histories? That's the question for this century in the war, that's right war, between science and religion, that will get worse as biotechnology and the nanotechnology industries really start pushing the boundaries of humanity.

==========

[GREG note: all dates below are approximate.]

#Pope Gregory I orders the burning of the library of Rome's Palatine Apollo
Pope Gregory I orders the burning of the library of Rome's Palatine Apollo, lest its secular literature distract the faithful from the contemplation of heaven. He also writes a book, a collection of saint's lives called "Dialogues", which displays an infantile credulity that would shame a tribal shaman.

#891-897
#Popes conspire with emperors, including disemboweling dead body of one Pope
Pope Formosus, playing political intrigue, first crowns Lambert, the Duke of Spoleto, as the Holy Roman Emperor, only to depose him a year later and crown Arnulf, the King of Germany. In 896, Formosus dies, and is succeeded by Pope Stephen VII. Pope Stephen VII, under the direction of Algitrude (the mother of Lambert and still humiliated at her son's deposition), puts the dead Pope Formosus on trial at Saint Peter's Cathedral. His body is disinterred, and ceremoniously carried into the hall and seated on the chair of Saint Peter. A long list of charges is read by Pope Stephen VII, including high treason, conniving and immorality. A defense lawyer is appointed, and many witnesses are interrogated. The verdict is pronounced, declaring Formosus guilty. His decrees and Papal bulls, as well as all the appointments he had made during the five years of his reign, are nullified. The presiding judge announces that as a symbol of his guilt the three fingers which the former Pope had used to pronounce the sacred Pontifical blessings are to be publicly severed, which happens in the Church of Saint Peter. Humiliated in death and shamefully multilated, the crimson robes are torn from the dead pope's body, the Papal crown removed, and what is left of the decaying corpse is flung through a window to the howling mob of Rome who had been promised this maccabre fun, and who procede to throw the body in the Tiber.

#872
#Pope Adrian II dies, the last married pope with children
Pope Adrian II dies, the last married pope (but not the last to father children). His wife and daughter lived with him in the papal palace.
[GREG note: not a crime here, but rather an illustration of the hypocrisy of the current Church's ban on priests getting married, a ban that in America has cost the Church over a billion dollars.]

#904
#Pope Sergius III has two predecessor popes murdered in prison
Pope Sergius III, formerly a bitter enemy of Formosus and elected through Spoletan influence, again causes Formosus' memory to be condemned, his acts to be annulled and his nominees evicted. Ruthless, power-loving and

lacking
all spiritual authority, Pope Sergius III rules by terror, starting with
the
murder in prison of both his predecessors, Pope Leo V and Pope Christopher.

#955
#Roman politician forces Church to make his son a pope, one of the worst
Alberic, a powerful Roman politician, just before his death in 954,
takes
an uncharacteristically foolish step. It was already understood that he
was
to be succeeded as Prince of the Romans by his teenage son Octavian, but he
also induces the magnates to swear that this imperially named youth should
be elected pope on the demise of Pope Agapetus II. This occurs in 955, and
the Romans duly carry out his wishes. Octavian becomes Pope John XII. The
result is that the papacy relapses into the disrepute from which Alberic
had
temporarily extracted it. Pope John's private tastes inclines towards
horses
and girls. According to a contemporary chronicler, he is addicted to
hunting 'not like an apostolic but a wild man; he adored his collection
of women .. hateful to the church, beloved of violent youth'. He has
cardinal deacon castrated - he calls upon the old Gods to help him at dice.

#962
#Pope John XII is accused in trial of bribery, adultery, and incest
Pope John XII, known as a playboy, is accused in public trial of having
taken bribes for the consecration of bishops, of having appointed a
ten-year
old boy to serve as bishop, of having committed adultery with his father's
mistress, and of having had incestuous relations with his father's widow.

#963
#Pope John XII is deposed, reinstated and tortures Vatican opponents
German Emperor Otto recognizes and supports Pope John XII. The Pope
grows uncomfortable with this, and conspires with enemies of the Emperor.
Otto marches on Rome, and Pope John escapes to Tivoli, taking with him the
treasures of Saint Peter. Otto convokes a synod that deposes Pope John in
his absence for immoral conduct and treason. The Romans are forced to
elect
a layman papal archivist as Pope Leo VIII. But however strongly they
disapproved of Pope John's morals, they preferred him to anyone imposed
upon
them by a German tyrant. So as soon as Otto's back is turned they restore
Pope John. While simply excommunicating Leo, he punishes some of his
clerical critics with revolting cruelty. One has his nose, tongue and two
fingers cut off, another lost his hand.

#964
#Pope John XII beaten to death while committing adultery

A notorious womanizer, Pope John XII was violating the sixth and ninth commandments with a married woman when her husband walked in and caught them in the act. The husband beat Pope John XII severely; he died of his injuries a few days later. According to another version of this story, Pope John XII died of a stroke while committing adultery.

#985

#Pope Boniface VII is murdered and dragged naked through Rome

Pope Boniface VII ranks as one of the bloodiest popes. An antipope in 974, and then 984 to 985. In 974, the Crescenti family of Italy arranges the overthrow of Pope Benedict VI (picked by the German emperor Otto I), who they throw in prison, making Boniface Franco pope Boniface VII. Hearing representatives of Otto are approaching Rome, Pope Boniface VII has ex-pope Benedict VI strangled to death. Pope Boniface is chased out of Rome, but is back in power in 984 with the help of the Byzantines. He imprisons Pope John XIV and has him murdered, and then proceeds to crush opposition in Rome, including having one cardinal blinded. He is killed in 985, and his dead body is dragged through the streets, stripped naked and exposed to abuse by the crowds such as piercing the body with spears.

#1021

#Jews are tortured and burned in Rome for 'causing' an earthquake

An earthquake followed by a hurricane strikes Rome on Good Friday. Pope Benedict VIII arrests a number of Jews who allegedly had put a nail through a host on Holy Thursday, as the probable cause of the calamity. They 'confess' during the torture of interrogation and are burned.

#1024

#Dead popes family bribes church to make his brother the new pope

When Pope Benedict VIII dies, his family bribes church officials intoordaining his brother a priest and electing him Pope John XIX in one day.

#1033-1044

#Pope Benedict IX rules "as if a demon from Hell"

The historian Gregorovius writes of the rule of Pope Benedict IX, "It seemed as if a demon from Hell in the disguise of a priest occupied the chair of Peter and profaned the sacred mysteries of religion by his insolent courses. Protected by his brother Gregory, who ruled the city as Senator of the Romans, Pope Benedict IX led the unchecked life of a Turkish Sultan in the Palace of the Lateran. He and his family filled Rome with robbery and murder". In 1044, the people of Rome rise up against the Pope, who yields, and in 1045 Sylvester III is elected Pope. Forty nine days later, he is driven from the Papal chair, and Benedict IX becomes Pope again.

Near the end of the year, desiring to marry his cousin, Pope Benedict IX takes the unheard of step and abdicates as Pope, encouraged supposedly with a bribe of over 1500 pounds of silver from John Gratian Pierleone, who

becomes Pope Gregory VI.

[GREG note: the following is an intellectual crime of the worst arrogance.]
#1074
#Pope Gregory VII decrees for popes near absolute political power
Pope Gregory VII, unsuccessful in his attempts to eliminate corruption in the Roman Catholic Church, issues the "Dictatus Papae", the Papal Dictatorship, the most radical decree in the history of the Church. The full
text is as follows (italics added):

1) That the Roman Church was founded by God alone;
2) That the Roman Pontiff alone can with right be called UNIVERSAL;
3) That he alone can depose and reinstate bishop;
4) That, in a council, his legate, even if a lower grade, is above all bishops, and can pass sentence of deposition against them;
5) That the Pope may depose the absent;
6) That, among other things, we ought not to remain in the same house with those excommunicated by him;
7) That for him alone is it lawful, according to the needs of the time, to make new laws, to assemble new congregations, to make an abbey of a canonry; and on the other hand, to divide a rich bishopric and unite poor ones;
8) That he alone may use the Imperial insignia;
9) That of the Pope alone ALL PRINCES SHALL KISS HIS FEET;
10) That HIS NAME ALONE shall be spoken in churches;
11) That THIS IS THE ONLY NAME IN THE WORLD;
12) That it may be permitted to him to DEPOSE EMPERORS;
13) That he may be permitted to transfer bishops if need be;
14) That he has the power to ordain a clerk of any church he may wish;
15) That he who is ordained by him may preside over another church, but may not hold a subordinate position; and that such a one may not receive a higher grade from any bishop;
16) That no synod shall be called a general synod without his order;
17) That no chapter and NO BOOK SHALL BE CANONICAL WITHOUT HIS AUTHORITY:
18) That a sentence passed by him may be retracted by no one; and that he himself, alone of all, may retract it;
19) That HE HIMSELF MAY BE JUDGED BY NO ONE;
20) That no one shall dare to condemn one who appeals to the Apostolic Church;
21) That to the latter should be referred the more important cases of every church;
22) That THE ROMAN CHURCH HAS NEVER ERRED; NOR WILL IT ERR TO ALL ETERNITY, the Scripture bearing witness;
23) That the Roman Pontiff, if he has been canonically ordained, is undoubtedly MADE A SAINT by the merits of St.Peter; St. Ennodius, Bishop of Pavia, bearing witness, and many holy fathers agreeing with him. As is contained in the decrees of St. Symmachus, the Pope;
24) That, by his consent, it may be lawful for subordinates to bring accusations;
25) That he may depose and reinstate bishops without assembling a synod.
26) That he who is not at peace with the Roman Church SHALL NOT BE CONSIDERED CATHOLIC;

27) That he may ABSOLVE SUBJECTS FROM THEIR FEALTY TO WICKED MEN.

#1078
#Pope Gregory VII bars Jews from all political offices in Europe
Pope Gregory VII bars Jews from any office in Christendom or any supremacy over Christians. In 1081, Pope Gregory VII reprimands Alfonso VI of Toledo for appointing Jews to court and diplomatic positions. In a letter to the King, he writes "But since we are bound not only to congratulate you upon the glories of your well-doing but sorrowfully to restrain you from unworthy actions, we have to enjoin you no longer to permit Jews in your country to rule over Christians or have power over them. For to place Christians under Jews or to subject them to their jurisdiction - what is that but to oppress the Church of God, to exult the synagogue of Satan, and in aiming to please the enemies of Christ to throw contempt upon Christ himself".

#1080
#Pope Gregory VII incorrectly tries to predict the future
Pope Gregory VII, identifying with Biblical prophets, starts predicting the future. During Easter services, at the height of his war with King Henry, he proclaims solemnly that within a year's time Henry would be dead were he not to obey the Papal command, and should this prophecy not come true, he himself, Gregory, would cease to be the Pope. As it turns out, Henry did not die, and Gregory remains Pope.

#1088, November
#Pope Urban II starts the crusades, to stop Christians from killing each other
Pope Urban II, realizing that Christianity is hopelessly fragmented due to wars between kings and popes, seeks something dramatic to engage people in a common goal. Speaking to a Council in Clermont, he makes the call for the First Crusade. From unofficial reports of the council, he first reviews current practices of Christian leaders in Europe. "Rise and turn your weapons now used against your brothers against your enemies, the enemies of Christianity. You oppress orphans and widows, you indulge in murder and rape, you rob your own people on the highways of your country, you accept bribes to kill fellow Christians and unashamedly shed their blood. You are like carrion birds attracted by the stench of human corpses, victims of your greed". Then the call for the crusade. "Rise then, no longer against your fellow Christians, but against your enemies who have taken the holy city of Jerusalem. Fight under the banner of Christ, your only commander-in-chief. God wills it".

#1091
#Pope Urban II declares that all islands in the world belong to the pope
Pope Urban II, in the papal bulls "Casu Universae Insulae" and "Cum

Omnes
Insulae", puts forth the doctrine that all islands in the world belong to the
pope, and may be assigned by him to whom he wills at his good pleasure."
About two hundred years later, Pope Innocent IV states that "We believe that
the pope, who is the vicar of Christ, has power not only over Christians but
also over all unbelievers, since Christ has power over all".

#1120
#Pope Calixtus issues an edict to kill most but not all Jews
Pope Calixtus issues an edict, 'Constitutio pro Judaeis', which while praised for offering protection to the Jews, meant that they were to live in a state of misery and degradation. The Pope's edict, begins with the recommendation that Jews may be persecuted, but not too much:

> "Although the Jewish perfidy is in every way worthy of condemnation, nevertheless, because through them the truth of our own faith is proved, they are not to be severely oppressed by the faithful".

The Pope's prohibition against killing Jews reads as if it were based, not primarily on their natural rights as human beings, but on motives of ecclesiastical expediency:

> "Thus the prophet says 'thou shall not kill them lest at any time they forget the law', or more clearly stated 'thou shalt not destroy the Jews completely so that the Christians should never by any chance be able to forget Thy Law..."

The edict is later reissued by Pope Innocent III in 1199.

#1130
#Through bribery and lies, Pope Innocent II is elected
To get elected pope, Pope Innocent II helps rig his own election. The College of Cardinals was split between conservatives and reformers when Pope
Honorius II died on the night of February 14, 1130 - and rather than risk losing a fair election, the reformers proclaimed Innocent II pope at sunrise,
without even telling the conservatives that Honorius had died. They found out three hours later and elected their own pope, Anacletus II, igniting an eight year power struggle that didn't end until Anacletus died in 1138... and Pope Innocent II finally bribed enough conservative Cardinals into making him the undisputed head of the Catholic Church.

#1139
#A Vatican edict bans the use of the crossbow, except against Muslims
The crossbow, a breakthrow in weapons design, was extremely lethal. A Vatican edict bans the use of the crossbow, except against Muslims. The pope declares crossbows "deathful and hateful to God and unfit to be used by Christians", though doesn't mention other deadly weapons.

#1205
#Pope Innocent III censures Philip for being too lenient with Jews
Pope Innocent III censures Philip for being too lenient with Jews and threatens Alfonso, King of Castille with excommunication if he continues to treat Jews leniently.

#1207
#Pope Innocent III lays the ground work for punishment and the Inquisition
Pope Innocent III, in his "Cum ex officii nostri" orders the punishment of heretics as follows: "In order altogether to remove from the patrimony of St. Peter the defilement of heretics, we decree as perpetual law, that whatsoever heretic, especially if he be a Paterene, shall be found therein, shall immediately be taken and delivered to the secular court to be punished
according to law. All his goods also shall be sold, so that he who took him shall receive one part, another shall go to the court which convicted him, and the third shall be applied to the building of prisons in the country wherein he was taken. The house, however, in which a heretic had been received shall be altogether destroyed, nor shall anyone presume to rebuild it; but let that which was a den of inquity become a receptacle of filth. Moreover, their believers and defenders and favorers shall be fined one fourth part of their goods, which shall be applied to the service of the public."
This decrees reflects the shift from correction to punishment in dealing
with heresy, laying the groundworks for the Inquisition.

#1208
#Pope Innocent III writes that Jews should be condemned to slavery
Pope Innocent III, in a letter writes, "The Jews, like the fraticide Cain, are doomed to wander about the earth as fugitives and vagabonds, and their faces must be covered with shame. They are under no circumstances to be protected by Christian princes, but, on the contrary to be condemned to serfdom."

#1209
#20000 Albigensians are massacred by papal troops
In the crusade against the Albigensian heresy, the city of Beziers is stormed and the inhabitants massacred. Twenty thousand people perish. Soldiers reportedly ask their papal adviser how to distinguish the faithful from the infidel among the captives, and are told "Kill them all. God will know his own.".

#1215
#Pope Innocent III issues more decrees punishing the Jews
Pope Innocent III, presiding over the Fourth Lateran Council, passes four decrees covering Jews: Christian princes are to keep close watch over Jewish usury and tithes from property passed to their hands were to be paid to the Church; baptized Jews are forbidden to practice Jewish customs;

Jews
are forbidden to appear in public at Easter time and are barred from public office; and Jews are required to a distinguishing badge, the Jewish badge.

To stem the tide of frequent social, and sometimes sexual, intercourse between Jews and Gentiles, they rule that "Therefore that they might not, under the pretense of error of this sort, excuse themselves in the future for the excesses of such prohibited intercourse, we decree that such Jews.. of both sexes in every Christian province and at all times shall be marked off in the eyes of the public form other peoples through the character of their dress".

#1227
#Pope Gregory IX orders Conrad Tors to investigate a sect. Tors is a burner

Pope Gregory IX orders Conrad Tors to investigate the Leciferans, a sect in Germany that believed that everything worldly was evil, and as God could have not created evil, it followed that the devil must have made the world. Conrad Tors motto was "It is fitting to burn a hundred innocent in order to destroy one heretic among them."

#1231
#Pope Gregory IX officially establishes the Inquisition, with death penalties

Pope Gregory IX officially establishes the Inquisition under papal authority. In his letter "Ille humani generis", the Pope links the spread of heresy directly to the malice of Satan, complaining that heretics now teach openly and contemptuously of Church authority. In his decree, "Excommunicamus", the Pope clearly establishes that from 1231 on, the "animadversio debita" punishment or 'debt of hatred' for heretics can only be the death penalty, instead of civil penalties that had been applied since
the 1100's.

#1239
#Pope Gregory IX orders all copies of the Talmud confiscated in Europe

Pope Gregory IX orders all copies of the Talmud confiscated in France, England, Castile, Aragon, and Portugal. The seizure is to take place on Saturday, March 3, 1240, when all Jews would be in their synagogues. The books are to be turned over to the Dominicans and Franciscans for examination.
Pope Gregory IX's position is that the Talmud contain blasphemies against Christ and Mary.

#1243
#Pope orders burning of over 20,000 Hebrew manuscripts in France

Under instructions from Pope Innocent IV, King Louis IX of France burns over 20,000 Hebrew manuscripts, mainly of the Talmud, in Paris. For this act,
the king is sainted and remains known as St. Louis. Actions such as these eventually result in only one complete Talmud Manuscript surviving from the

Middle Ages.

#1248
#Ten children of Emperor Frederick II are killed in papal dungeons in Rome
Ten children and grandchildren of Emperor Frederick II are killed in papal dungeons in Rome. Pope Innocent IV had declared war against the Emperor's House of Hohenstaufen, after publicly denoucing the Emperor as a blasphemer.

#1278
#Jews are compelled by the Pope to attend conversion sermons
Pope Nicholas III issues a papal bull ordering preachers to be sent out all over Europe to convert the Jews. The Jews are to be compelled to attend these conversion services.

#1300
#A misinterpreted Papal bull condemns surgery, halting progress in medicine
A papal bull from Pope Boniface VIII is issued that misinterpreted, leads to the detriment of anatomical study. In the bull, the Pope decrees that whoever dares to cut up a human body or boil it should fall under the ban of the Church. This edict is intended to prohibit a practice of the crusaders,who, when one of their number dies during the pilgrimage to the Holy Land, cut up the body and boil it in order to obtain the bones, which can be conveniently transported back to relatives in Europe.
The papal bull against this practice is misinterpreted as applying to dissection for anatomical study. Surgeons are looked upon as menials. Under the influence of the Church the practice of surgery in Europe is relegated to barbers, bathhouse keepers, sowgelders, executioners, and any strolling vagabond who cares to try his hand at the art.

#1300
#One of the most prolific writers on birth control becomes Pope John XXII
Despite the church's position in favor of procreation, medieval writers, many of whom were churchmen, related practical information about contraceptives and early-term abortifacients. Indeed, one of the prolific writers on birth control techniques was Peter of Spain, author of "Treasury of the Poor", who became Pope John XXII.
[GREG note: which popes to believe? Earlier ones that supported birth control, current ones that don't?]

#1318
#Pope John XXII orders many Spirituals to be burned to death
Attacks on the papacy on theological terms come from some in the Franciscan order, which had been split between the Conventuals, who freely accepted Church discipline and observed a rule resembling those of other religious Orders, and the Spirituals who hankered after absolute poverty

and mystical perfection in accordance with their founder's principles. The differences between the two groups came to a head in 1318, when the Pope condemned the Spirituals on the ground that obedience was a greater virtue than either poverty or chastity, and unleashed a vicious persecution against
them. Many of the Spirituals are sent to the stake for their ascetic aspirations. Scandalized by the Pope's brutality, the Conventuals too, headed by the General of the Franciscan order, resolve to adhere to the principle of poverty, only to be convicted by the Pope of heresy. Its General, Michael of Cesena, is imprisoned at Avignon until he escapes to Germany, where he joins William of Ockham at Lewis's court. Pope John's unnecessary vendetta against the Franciscans and all other mystical movements
of the period alienates many churchmen and loses him sympathy of simple Catholics. For all his intelligence, ability and courage, he is utterly unspiritual and incapable of understanding the yearning of others.

#1348
#Over 1,000,000 people die in Rome due to the plague and Vatican greed
Pope Clement VI grants absolution from all sins of all Christians who should die on a journey to Rome, where in spite of the plague, a Holy Year is being celebrated. People are told that not only is absolution given, but the souls of those who die are to be carried straight to heaven without first passing through purgatory. By Easter 1,200,000 people from all parts of Europe gather at Rome.

Unfortunately (though not unforeseeable), some pilgrims bring the plague with them; it spreads rapidly through the crowded people. Scarcely 10 percent live to return to their homes, a loss of over a million people. But the offerings that the pilgrims make or are left to the Church amount to an enormous sum.

#1352
#Pope Innocent VI gets elected by lying to fellow Cardinals
Pope Innocent VI is elected pope largely through his own dishonest. When
the College of Cardinals can't agree upon a successor to Pope Clement VI, each
cardinal vowed to the others that if he were the one elected pope, he would share the papacy's power (and revenues) with the other cardinals. Innocent agreed only "in so far as it was not contrary to church law" and then declared
the agreement contrary to church law as soon as he became pope, keeping all the power and money for himself.

#1369
#Pope Urban V rejoices in the death of a king who protected the Jews
Henry finally defeats King Pedro. Pope Urban V issues the following statement: "The Church must rejoice at the death of such a tryant, a rebel against the Church, and a favorer of Jews and Saracens. The righteous exult
in retribution", upon hearing of Pedro's execution.

#1377

#Pope Gregory XI issues five bulls attacking doctrines for democracy

Pope Gregory XI issues five bulls attacking John Wycliffe's doctrines as expounded in his treatise on civil lordship. "De Civili Dominio", which had been read to Wycliffe's students at Oxford in the previous year. In a 1382 Bible translation, Wycliffe included the following dedication that reflected his views: "This Bible is for the government of the people, by the
people, and for the people".

#1378

#Two corrupt popes are elected, splitting the Church in Europe for years

In 1378, Pope Urban VI is elected. His failures spring not from his convictions and policy but from a basic instability of character and explosions of a violent temperament which he proves unable to keep in check.

This treatment of the Cardinals is offensive in the extreme. The French Cardinals leave Rome and eventually reside near the Naples border, where they declare Urban's election to have been uncanonical and elect Robert of Geneva, the warrior-prelate, as Pope Clement VII. Each Pope formally excommunicates the other, while Urban appoints new Cardinals to replace those that seceded. Clement eventually settles in Avignon under the protection of the French court, where much of the church hierarchy had remained instead of returning to Rome. War breaks out in Italy between different factions.

Urban becomes so savage and unpredictable that his Cardinals begin to intrigue against him. When he gets wind of the plot, he throws six of them into the dungeons and subjects them to torture. He flees residences a few times, and has most of the jailed Cardinals killed. He returns to Rome and dies in 1387. Clement meanwhile has with him in Avignon the Apostolic Camera, the fiscal department of the Church, and the French King allows Clement's tax collectors to inflict suffering on the French people. The best thing that was said of Urban by a comtemporary is that Urban put more money into the treasury than he took out.

The Church now has two popes, two papal capitals, two Colleges of Cardinals, and two curial systems, both fully staffed and furiously competing with each other. Moreover, Europe has split into two political camps, each supporting a different pontiff. The universities take sides; the monastic and mendicant orders are all internally divided.

The resulting disarray among the laity is even more grevious. How can it be otherwise when one Pope is behaving like a bloodthirsty lunatic and the other is openly obsessed by secular aims and the systematic extortion of money from the faithful?

#1415

#Pope Benedict XIII orders the Jews to attend conversion sermons, or die

One of the two Popes, Pope Benedict XIII, orders the confiscation of the Talmud and decrees that all Jews are to attend sermons for their conversion. The penalty for refusing is death. A papal bull forbids Jews to have, study, or read the Talmud.

#1442
#Pope Eugenius IV forbids Christians to eat, drink, or live with Jews
Pope Eugenius IV in a bull for Castile forbids Christians to eat, drink, bathe, or live with Jews or to use medicine of any kind prescribed by them. Jews are ineligible for any office or honor. No new synagogues are to be built. Jews have to remain indoors during Easter. The testimony of Jews against Christians is declared invalid. Jews are to be distinguished from Christians by special dress and special quarters.

Pope Eugenius IV also orders magistrates to fine Jews and impose "most severe penalties as they may see fit" because Jews "blasphemed God, the most glorious Virgin mother, or some saints, or else in some other way commit transgressions of this kind".

#1447
#Pope Nicholas V continues the repressive Jewish policies of Pope Eugenius IV
Pope Nicholas V continues the repressive policies of Pope Eugenius IV. (Pope Eugenius IV in a bull for Castile forbids Christians to eat, drink, bathe, or live with Jews or to use medicine of any kind prescribed by them. Jews are ineligible for any office or honor. No new synagogues are to be built. Jews have to remain indoors during Easter. The testimony of Jews against Christians is declared invalid. Jews are to be distinguished from Christians by special dress and special quarters.)

#1456
#Pope Calixtus attempts to excommunicate Halley's comet.

#1479
#Pope Sixtus IV increases taxes and sales of indulgences to cover big debts
The Holy See is deeply in debt, due to the mismanagement of the Vatican under Pope Sixtus IV. In order to device new ways of raising money, a second financial department, the Datary, is set up alongside the Apostolic Camera. Its main function is to receive the proceeds of a greatly increased issue of plenary indulgences during and after the Jubilee in 1475. Heavier taxes are exacted from the papal state, within which the Pope establishes a lucrative monopoly in grain. Offices and sinecures, many of them newly invented, are freely put up for sale. A Carmelite from Mantua, writes '... your temples, priests, altars, rites ... prayers, heaven and God too are for sale'.

#1481
#Pope Sixtus IV loses church money badly playing Italian politics
Pope Sixtus IV involves the Papal state in a dreary power game with the other major Italian states, Venice, Milan, Florence and Naples. The Pope spends much time arranging numerous shifting alliances and petty campaigns,

losing much money in the process and gaining little. As Geoffrey Barraclough points out about the papacy, 'it thereby lost its universal pretensions and position ... ceased effectively to be the head of Christendom
and became instead one of the Italian powers', with the Pope just another Italian despot. The Pope sacrifices what Eugenius and his immediate successors had regained in terms of moral prestige since the end of the schism.

#1484
#Pope Innocent VIII the first to declare his illegitimate children
Was nicknamed "the Honest" because he is the first pope to publicly acknowledge his illegitimate children. Despite his nickname, he is a terrible pope - as the church's own New Catholic Encyclopedia put it, "The moral and political disorders of the time called for a pontiff of character and nobility; Innocent possessed neither". He became pope largely through bribing the other cardinals; drove the church nearly bankrupt by embroiling it in several Italian wars; and auctioned off curial posts to the highest bidder.

#1484
#Pope Innocent VIII trades a dowry for making a 13 year old a Cardinal
Pope Innocent VIII manages to betroth his son Franceschetto, an undistinguished parasite, to Madalena, the daughter of Lorenzo de' Medici of Florence, at the price of making Lorenzo's 13 year-old son Giovanni a Cardinal of the church.

#1486
#A census of Rome finds over 7000 female prositutes servicing the Church
During Pope Sixtus IV's pontificate, an official census of Roman prostitutes is taken, with some seven thousand female prostitutes counted among a total population estimated at seventy thousand (a rate ten times higher than in most modern cities). Rome, a city where almost everyone is connected in one way or another with the Church, keeps more prostitutes busy than any other.
#1490's
#Pope Alexander VI gives prizes to men having sex with papal prostitutes
At one of the many orgies he hosted, Pope Alexander VI gave prizes to the men "who copulated the most times" with the papal prostitutes.

#1495
#Cardinal Borgia murders his brother Juan; their father the Pope does nothing
Pope Alexander had intended that this favorite son, Juan Duke of Gandia,
should become a great territorial prince and even aspire to the throne of Naples. However, his hopes are dashed when Juan disappears one night after dining with this brother, Cardinal Caeser Borgia, and Juan's body is hauled out of the Tiber on the next day pierced with nine wounds. Suspicion falls on Caeser, with the most likely explanation being that Caesar had become

jealous of Juan's worldly prospects. As a mere Cardinal-deacon he seemed destined for a secondary part. However that may be, he was almost certainly
the murderer, and in the next few years he is to do away with a host of real
and fancied enemies. The Pope himself appears to go in awe of Caeser, and soon suspends the official inquiry into Juan's murder.

#1500's
#Papal homosexual lovers - Pope Julius III and Cardinal Innocenzo

One of the few openly gay popes, Pope Julius III had as a teenage lover one Cardinal Innocenzo. Pope Julius III "created a scandal by his infatuation with a fifteen-year-old youth, Innocenzo, picked up on the streets of Parma, whom he made his brother adopt and then named a cardinal",
according to the Oxford Dictionary of Popes. Cardinal Innocenzo was also keeper of the pope's pet ape.

#1503
#Pope Alexander VI dies, a man 'more lucky and evil than any Pope before'

In 1503 Pope Alexander VI dies suddenly due to an infection. According to the Florentine historian Guicciardini, Pope Alexander was guilty of avarice, cruelty, injustice and duplicity, vices common to most Renaissance sovereigns. Lacking as he was in any spark of religious feeling, he took a perversely short-sighted view of his office, and though a man 'of the utmost power and of great judgement and spirit', he dissipated and misused his qualities. In other words, as Guicciardini sums up, 'he was more evil and more lucky, than, perhaps any Pope before'.

#1513
#Pope Leo X introduces more corruption into the Vatican

In 1513, Giovanni de' Medici, son of Lorenzo the Magnificent who had been made a Cardinal at the age of 13, is elected as Pope Leo X. His gorgeous inaugural pageant cost 100,000 ducats, and his court life was a continuous round of festivities, banquets, carnivals, theatrical shows, balls and hunting parties. Papal finances are badly damaged by Pope Leo's lavishness, and the Holy See is reduced to living from hand to mouth off credit from Roman and Florentine bankers. In order to recoup his losses, Pope Leo multiples the sale of church offices and indulgences. He also milks the Cardinals, many of whom are very well off financially anyways. His mass creation of 31 new members of the College of Cardinals in 1517 nets
him 500,000 ducats.

He is as inept with politics, first opposing the French king against the
Spanish until the French king wins a major battle at Bologna. A few years later, he agrees to an anti-French alliance with the Germans, whose support he knew was needed to combat the Lutheran movement growing in Germany.

#1545

#French Catholics slaughter about 3000 Waldensians, with thanks from the Pope

French Catholic authorities, at the instigation of Cardinal de Tournon, attack some peaceable villages and slaughter about three thousand Waldensian, including women and children. Pope Paul III congratulates themilitary commander for his pious work, and makes him Count Palatine.

#1553

#Pope Julius III signs a decree ordering the seizure and burning of Talmuds

Pope Julius III approves and signs a decree presented by the Inquistor General that order the seizure of the Talmud. On September 9, 1553, the Jewish New Year, all copies of the Talmud and compilations from it in Rome are burned. The same occurs in Romagna, Ferrara, Mantua, Padua, Venice and Candia. Other Hebrew books, including the bible, are seized and burned. In 1554 Pope Julius III issues a papul bull that compels Jews under threat of corporal punishment to surrender all copies of the Talmud.

#1555

#Pope Paul IV's papal bull keeps Jews in ghettos and wearing special clothes

Pope Paul IV, in a bull for the papal states, renews enforcement of canonical laws pertaining to Jews. Segregation in ghettos is continued; all synagogues except one are destroyed; all male Jews are required to wear a green cap and females Jews to wear a green veil. Jews are barred from professions and forbidden to own real estate. Those who own real estate are compelled to sell it within six months. Christians are not to be employed by Jews in any capacity. Jewish physicians are forbidded to treat Christians under heavy penalties.

Jews are confined to on walled area in Rome, with just a single entrance and exit, and there is to be only one synangogue to handle five congregations. Jews are also forced to attend sermons, intended to convert them to Christianity, at the Church of San Gregorio, just outside the ghetto.

#1569

#Pope Pius V orders all Jews out of the Papal states

Pope Pius V issues a papal bull, Bull Hebraeorum Gens, ordering all Jews out of the Papal States except Rome and Ancona within three months. Those who remain behind will be sold into slavery.

#1585

#Pope Sixtus V orders execution of 7000 Italian bandits

Upon his election, Pope Sixtus V demonstrates the severity and efficiency of his government, by exterminating the bandits who infest the papal state, said to number 27,000 at the time. The bandits frequently operate in collusion with local nobles who give them asylum and share in the spoils.

The Pope shows no mercy to the robbers or to their protectors, 7,000 of whom
are executed, and as the Pope remarks to the French Ambassador, Cardinal de Joyeuse, he wishes that he had done away with more than 20,000.

#1585
#Pope Sixtus V allows papal government to rob the citizens

Pope Sixtus V tackles the problem of public finances, and during his five year he builds up a surplus of 4 million gold crowns (scudi). This is achieved partly by economics but mainly through the sale of offices (not ecclesiastical but bureaucratic) in the state administration, which brings in 300,000 scudi yearly. Naturally the officials, having purchased their jobs, fleece the taxpayers.

#1600
#Girodano Bruno is burned at the stake on orders from the Pope.

Giordano Bruno is burned at the stake on orders from the Pope. In 1584, Bruno had written a book advocating the Copernican view of the universe, and how it applied to the difference between Protestants and Catholics with regards to the Eucharist. His hopes were to unify the Protestant English and Catholic French. Unfortunately, Rome supported Spain and it's status quo position in Europe. After his arrest and trial by the Inquisition, the Pope orders Bruno's execution.

#1623
#Pope Urban VIII lets his family steal millions from the Church

Matteo Barberini becomes Pope Urban VIII in 1623, and one of his goals is
to make sure that the Barberini family would leave a more indelible mark on Rome than any previous papal family. One of the Pope's brothers, Antonio, and two nephews, Francesco and Antonio, are promptly made Cardinals. Enormous
sums of money are channelled from the papal revenues into their coffers and those of their lay relatives, another brother Carlo and his son Taddeo. Carlo and Francesco are said to have received a total of 105 million scudi, while only half the benefices granted to one of the Antonios brought in an annual income of 4 million. The family also accumulated lands, castles, palaces and villas; in 1630 the Pope buys the principality of Palestrina for
Taddeo for 725,000.

For two decades under Pope Urban, this nepotism ruins the finances of the papal state, carrying on into the reign of Pope Alexander VII, so that by
1658 the papal debt rises from 12 to nearly 40 million scudi. Nepotism ran riot, but the Vatican was so constituted that nobody except the Pope could halt it.

#1642
#Pope Urban VIII tries to steal the lands of an Italian duke

Pope Urban VIII, without any justification, tries to browbeat the Duke

of
Parma into surrendering his secondary duchy of Castro and Ronciglione, which
he held as a papal fief, to his family, the Barberini. When the Duke refuses,
the Pope excommunicates him and invades his duchy. Put the papal force is repulsed and the Duke's men, reinforced by Venice and other independent Italian states, counterattack and ravage papal territory. War last for two years at the cost of 6 million scudi.

#1648
#Pope Innocent X condemns the peace between Protestants and Catholics
The Thirty Years War between Catholics and Protestants in Germany ends, with negotiations at Munster leading to the treaty the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. The war had caused great suffering, with some regions of Germany losing two-thirds of their inhabitants. All the belligerents, especially Emperor Ferdinand III, are desperate for peace. Moreover, they know that it
can only be secured by the exercise of some degree of mutual toleration and the acceptance of the principle of equality of rights between Catholics and Protestants.

When the terms are eventually agreed to, Pope Innocent X denounces them as a betrayal of the Catholic cause. In a thunderous Bull, he declares them
to be 'null and void, accursed and without any validity or effect for the past, present and future'. Fortunately, no one paid much attention to this attempt to prolong the bloodshed and devastation.

#1747
#Pope Benedict XIV asserts that Jewish children can be baptized forcibly
Pope Benedict XIV issues a papal bull that asserts that Jewish children over the age of seven can be baptized against the will of their parents.

#1773
#Pope Clement XIV orders the Jesuits to disband, calling them completely evil
Jesuits had been responsible for the murder of Wallenstein. The Long Parliament's belief that the English Civil Wars were caused by a 'Jesuitical
conspiracy' was on record. Hence, very typically, the Jesuits were at their
old games in the 1750s. Some of them officered private armies which were waging war in Paraguay on the royal forces of Portugal and Spain. Others were actively fomenting rebellion against the Portuguese crown in Brazil. Others were plotting the assassination of the King of Portugal while others fomented popular uprisings in Madrid. Clement XIV, in his Suppression Bull,
Dominus ac Redemptor, of 1773, added that the Society had, in effect, enslaved the Papacy, extorting from it by undue influence great and unheard of privileges and monopolies. It had used the same sort of influence to defect, one by one, a long series of efforts by 'non-Jesuit' Popes to

reform
it radically and reduce it to obedience. The Society was therefore, according to the greatest authorities in Christendom, thoroughly evil.

#1775
#Pope Pius VI decrees that Jews must listen to conversion sermons
Pope Pius VI, in a papal bull for the papal states, decrees that Jews living there must listen to conversion sermons to be delivered in the synagogues following the Sabbath services.

#1815
#Pope Pius VII returns to Rome and reinstitutes the Inquisition
Pope Pius VII returns to Rome and reinstitutes the Inquisition. Jews in the papal states are driven back into ghettoes and stripped of civil rights, liberties and positions granted by the city republics. Conversion sermons are again required and a tradition of forcing the Jews to run the gauntlet among the Corso during the Roman Carnival is established.

#1823
#Pope Leo XII turns the papal states into a repressive police state
In 1815, Pope Pius VII regains control of the papal states of Italy, and reimposes ecclesiastical authority. The inhabitants do not take too kindly to the rule of priests, with organized Catholic partisans clashing with anti-clerical activists. The papal states are divided into 21 districts,
each governed by a Cardinal-legate or a delegate-churchman, and all former municipal and feudal liberties are abolished. It was thus ruled by a mainly
clerical bureaucracy, which in the following years becomes increasingly incompetent and corrupt.
In 1823, Pope Leo XII takes over, who has a weak personality and leans on the intransigent ultra-clericals. During his reign, the papal government acquires its unwholesome reputation as a repressive police state. Pope Leo's
energies are expended in strengthening theocratic rule and forcibly suppressing. His legate at Ravenna, Cardinal Rivarola, uses the papalist partisans to strike at their liberal counterparts. Some of the latter are executed and many imprisoned. Such severities quickly grow into a reign of terror in the Legations, Umbria and the Marches. Meanwhile Rome and the Patrimony receive a dose of bigotry and austerity. A heavy censorship is imposed, the Jews are confined once more to their ghetto, educational opportunities are narrowed and morality enforced by niggling regulations.

#1823
#Pope Leo XII reestablishes the Jewish ghetto in Rome, and conversion sermons
Pope Leo XII reestablishes the ghetto in Rome, which had been opened by the Napoleonic armies during the occupation of Italy, and order the revival of forced conversion sermons on the Sabbath.

#1830's

#Pope Gregory XVI declares freedom of speech a social plague

Pope Gregory XVI declares freedom of speech to be wrong. "From the polluted fountain of indifferentism flows that absurd and erroneous doctrine, or rather, raving, which claims and defends liberty of conscience for everyone. For this comes, in a word, the worst plague of all, namely unrestrained liberty of opinion and freedom of speech... It is no way lawful to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of thought, or speech, or writing, or of religion, as if they were so many rights that nature has given to man".

#1848

#Pope Pius IX with French troops prevent the Jews from leaving their ghetto

In April, during the revolution, the gates of the Roman ghetto are torn down and the Jews liberated. The liberation is short lived however, because Pope Pius IX with the help of French troops reestablished the ghetto and punishes the Jews for participating in the revolution.

#1855

#Pope Pius IX grants a mass for a female saint who actually never existed

In the early 1800's, three tiles are excavated in a catacomb near Rome, bearing the letters "LUMENA PAX TE CUM FI", which rearranged could be read as "PAX TECUM FILUMENA - peace to you Philomena". Nearby is an ampulla
containing what was looked on as blood. When this supposed blood was moved to Mugnano in 1805, so many miracles occur that Philomena was popularly deemed a saint. Fifty years later Pope Pius IX grants the holy woman her own proper office and mass. Her fame spreads enormously. Nuns at their profession took her name. In the mid 1900's, though, the Vatican decides that she had never lived.

#1860s

#Pope Pius IX supports Ultramontanes, who reject science and logic

The Ultramontane movement, which gained ground ever more widely after 1850, stood for aggression and a heavy stress on Catholic doctrines and practices which were most obnoxious to moderns. Ultramontanes loathed science and rational enquiry in matters of religion: they exalted tradition,
insight, instinct and the supernatural. They thought of the Pope as, by God's appointment, their inspired leader, endowed by virtue of his office with infallible judgement, supernatural insight, absolute spiritual power and great holiness. They revived old theories that the Pope had an 'indirect power' to censure and control governments. To the Ultramontane therefore Catholic loyalty required that bishops and religious superiors should be utterly subject to the Pope, that Roman devotions, liturgical customs, church fittings, and terminology should be copied throughout the Church.

Pope Pius IX was carried away by this tide of feeling. His public condemnations of 'modern errors' became more and more strident. The Ultramontanes loudly applauded his Syllabus of Errors in which he roundly

dismissed 19th-century liberalism as a tissue of heresies. In 1870, Pope Pius leads a Vatican council in declaring Papal Infallibility.

#1864
#The Vatican condemns democracy, freedom of speech, press and religious belief

In 1864, the Vatican had proclaimed the "Syllabus of Errors" and an accompanying encyclical, "Quanta Cura". In these the papacy denounced unrestricted freedom of speech and of the press. The concept of equal status
for all religions was totally rejected. The pope responsible for all these measures was Pius IX. He also made it clear that he disliked intensely the concept of democratic government and that his preference was for absolute monarchies. He further denounced "the proponents of freedom of conscience and freedom of religion" as well as "all of those who assert that the Church
may not use force".

#1870
#Pope Pius IX uses political intrigue to proclaim Papal infallibility

In 1870, Pope Pius IX summons Vatican Council I, indicated to the assembled bishops that the main item on the agenda was papal infallibility. HIS infallibility. After much intensive lobbying and some unchristianlike pressure, the pope suffers a major moral defeat when, out of over 1000 bishops entitled to take part in the Council, only 451 vote for infallibility.
But by a strategy of politicking and threatening, all but two dissenters leave
Rome before a final vote is taken. At the last meeting of the council, on July 18th, it was decided by 533 votes to 2 that the pope is infallible when
defining a doctrine concerning faith or morals.

Until they were liberated by Italian troops in 1870, the Jews in Rome had been locked in a ghetto by the pope who became infallible. He was similarly intolerant of Protestants and recommended the introduction of prison sentences for non-Catholics who were preaching in Tuscany.

#1933
#The Vatican signs a deal with Hitler, and gets over $400 million by 1945

In 1933 the Vatican negotiates successfully by signing a concordat between the Holy See and Hitler's Third Reich. This deal followed the 1929 concordat with Mussolini Fascist government in Italy. Cardinal Eugene Pacelli, the future Pope Pius XII, has a leading negotiating role as the Vatican's secretary of state in concluding a treaty with Nazi Germany. For the Vatican, one of the major advantages to emerge from the very
lucrative deal with Hitler was confirmation of the Kirchensteuer (church tax).
This is a state tax that is still deducted at source from all wage-earners in Germany. One can opt out by renouncing one's religion. In practice few choose to. This tax represents between 8 and 10 percent on income tax collected by the German government. The money is handed over to the

Protestant and Catholic churches. Substantial amounts derived from the Kirchensteuer began to flow to the Vatican in the years immediately preceding
the Second World War. The flow continued throughout that war ($100 million in 1943, for example).

#1947
#Using the rape of a child, Pope Pius XII denounces modern culture
Pope Pius XII, addresses the crowds from the balcony of Saint Peter's and declares blessed Maria Goretti, who allegedly was killed at the age of 12
while resisting the rape attempt of a neighbor. In an address that is reported
throughout Europe, the pope uses the occasion to denounce those in the movie
industry, the fashion industry, the press, the theater, and even the military
(which had recently conscripted women), for corrupting the chastity of youth.

#1958
#Pope John XXIII stops practice of priests kissing the Pope's shoes The traditional footwear of popes was a velvet slipper that either had
his coat of arms embroidered on the instep or was truly ornate with gold embroidery and perhaps even jewels, a cross on the instep. Customarily, a cleric entering the presence of the pope had to kneel down and kiss the crosses on the slippers, a practice found right up until the 1958 accession of Pope John XXIII, who found it absurd. One wonders why no previous pope came to this conclusion of humility.

==========

Given all of the papal anti-Semitic acts above, it is easier to agree with another comment in John Leo's Mar 27 article in US News & World Report:

> The document says the Holocaust "was certainly the result of the pagan ideology of Nazism." The Vatican has to stop inserting this line into its expressions of sorrow to the Jews. It's a way of discounting Christian antisemitism as a major factor in the extermination of Europe's Jews. Apart from the scale of the killings, there was nothing in the Nazi program for the Jews that hadn't been pioneered by centuries of Christian practice: from the forced wearing of a yellow badge, isolation, and rituals of humiliation to expropriation of property, banishment, and pogroms. The Nazis may have drawn their direct inspiration from a post-Christian version of purely racial antisemitism. But Christianity clearly prepared the way and lit the fuse.

And to be equally critical, the Protestents have their historical problems as well:

#1542

#Martin Luther urges leaders to expel Jews and to destroy their property

Luther turns against the Jews. He publishes a pamphlet, "Concerning the Jews and Their Lies", and urges the emperor and princes to expel the Jews from the country without delay. If the nobility did not, it was the duty of the robber knights, the clergy and the people. To quote Luther, "Because the Christians, for more than a thousand years had robbed them of all the rights of man, had treated them as evil beasts, had trodden underfoot, lacerated and slain them, in a word, becuase they had fallen into
distress through the harshness of Christians, therefore, they must be rejected, and the Savior of the world must must have appeared."

For their infinite blasphemies against Christ, he insists that Jews can not be tolerated. He urges that their synagogues, Talmuds and prayerbooks be burned, their houses destroyed, their monies confiscated, their rabbis forbidden to teach, and that no Jews be allowed to use the name of God under the penalty of death. All must be put to forced labor, or better still,
exiled. Had he the power, he says, he would cut out their tongues because of their blasphemies and force them to accept Christianity.

#1523

#Martin Luther supports killing 100,000 peasants for resisting Protestantism

Martin Luther, writing on heresy, takes a position opposite that of Augustine and Aquinas, saying "Christ did not wish to compel men into the faith by force and fire", "Every man should be allowed to believe as he will
and can, and no one should be constrained", and "heresy is a spiritual thing which can be cut with no iron, burned with no fire, and drowned with no water."

However, during the Peasant's war, Luther contradicts himself, advocating
the exclusive establishment of Lutheranism and the suppression of Mass by Protestant governments. News of the war leads him to call the peasants blasphemers and murderers, condemning their atrocities, but not atrocities of the princes who kill over 100,000 peasants. Luther writes, "In my opinion,
it is better that all of the peasants should be killed rather than the sovereigns and magristrates should be destroyed, because the peasants take up the sword without God's authorization."

#1536

#Martin Luther endorses death for Catholics to prevent their spreading

Martin Luther endorses imprisonment and death for Catholics to prevent their contagion. Mercy existed in heaven, said Luther, on the earth, the sword. Their Mass is blasphemous. Their Popes were blasphemers and antichrists. Their church is a synagogue for Satan. Catholics must be compelled to worship in Lutheran churches. The papal "asses" he says, "are such stupid asses that they cannot and will not distinguish between God's word and human doctrine, but hold them both as one".

==========

Greg Aharonian
Internet Patent News Service

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-NOV-2000 09:22:48.00

SUBJECT: fyi on stem cells

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

TEXT:
from today's ny times op-ed page:

November 1, 2000

A Crucial Election for Medical Research
By MICHAEL J. FOX

As a Parkinson's disease patient and a new American citizen, I look forward to Election Day as something momentous: It's not just the first presidential race in which I can vote (I was born in Canada). The outcome is likely to have a dramatic bearing on my prognosis ? and that of millions of Americans whose lives have been touched by Parkinson's, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, spinal cord injury, Huntington's disease, Alzheimer's disease and other devastating illnesses. That's because one question that may be decided on Tuesday is whether stem cell research ? which holds the best hope of a cure for such diseases ? will be permitted to go forward.
Campaign aides to George W. Bush, who has not publicly addressed the issue, stated on several occasions that a Bush administration would overturn current National Institutes of Health guideines and ban federal funding for stem cell research. Why? Because the research, which uses human embryos discarded from fertility clinics, has become enmeshed in the politics of abortion. Mr. Bush favors a ban on stem cell research, one aide said, "because of his pro-life views."
Yet stem cell research has nothing to do with abortion. It is not the same as fetal tissue research, the federal funding of which was banned by Presidents Reagan and Bush (but has since been authorized by Congress). Stem cell work uses undifferentiated cells extracted from embryos just a few days old ? embryos produced during in vitro fertilization, a process that creates many more fertilized eggs than are implanted in the wombs of women trying to become pregnant. Currently, more than 100,000 embryos are frozen in storage. Most of these microscopic clumps of cells are destined to be destroyed ? ending any potential for life.
Their potential for saving lives, however, may be unlimited. Given the proper signal or environment, stem cells, transplanted into human tissue, can be induced to develop into brain, heart, skin, bone marrow cells ? indeed, any specialized cells. The scientific research community believes that the transplanted stem cells may be able to regenerate dead or dying human tissue, reversing the progress of disease. According to Cure, a

coalition of 28 groups representing patients with cancer, Parkinson's, paralysis and other maladies, "no research in recent history has offered as much hope" for cures.
Support for stem-cell research comes not just from pro-choice Democrats like Al Gore but also from Republicans who have concluded, in the words of former Senator Bob Dole, that supporting such research is "the pro-life position to take."
The list includes Republican senators like Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, John McCain of Arizona, Connie Mack of Florida and Pete Domenici of New Mexico. Even Senator Gordon Smith of Oregon, who the National Right to Life Committee says voted "the right way" on abortion every time last year, supports the research. His family has experience with the ravages of Parkinson's disease, and he has concluded, "Part of my pro-life ethic is to make life better for the living."
This is the real compassionate conservatism. One hopes that between now and next Tuesday, Mr. Bush will explain to those of us with debilitating diseases ? indeed, to all of us ? why it is more pro-life to throw away stem cells than to put them to work saving lives.
Michael J. Fox, the actor, is active in organizations working to combat Parkinson's disease.

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

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

608-262-5015 (tel)
608-262-5485 (fax)

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>
from today's ny times op-ed page:

November 1, 2000

<table border=0>
<tr><td width=278><td width=172></td></tr>

<tr><td width=278><td width=172></td></tr>
</table>
A Crucial Election for Medical Research
By MICHAEL J. FOX

As a Parkinson's disease patient and a new American citizen, I look forward to Election Day as something momentous: It's not just the first presidential race in which I can vote (I was born in Canada). The outcome is likely to have a dramatic bearing on my prognosis and that of millions of Americans whose lives have been touched by Parkinson's, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, spinal cord injury, Huntington's disease, Alzheimer's disease and other devastating illnesses. That's because one question that may be decided on Tuesday is whether stem cell research which holds the best hope of a cure for such diseases will be permitted to go forward.
Campaign aides to George W. Bush, who has not publicly addressed the issue, stated on several occasions that a Bush administration would overturn current National Institutes of Health guideines and ban federal funding for stem cell research. Why? Because the research, which uses human embryos discarded from fertility clinics, has become enmeshed in the politics of abortion. Mr. Bush favors a ban on stem cell research, one aide said, "because of his pro-life views."
Yet stem cell research has nothing to do with abortion. It is not the same as fetal tissue research, the federal funding of which was banned by Presidents Reagan and Bush (but has since been authorized by Congress). Stem cell work uses undifferentiated cells extracted from embryos just a few days old embryos produced during in vitro fertilization, a process that creates many more fertilized eggs than are implanted in the wombs of women trying to become pregnant. Currently, more than 100,000 embryos are frozen in storage. Most of these microscopic clumps of cells are destined to be destroyed ending any potential for life.
Their potential for saving lives, however, may be unlimited. Given the proper signal or environment, stem cells, transplanted into human tissue, can be induced to develop into brain, heart, skin, bone marrow cells indeed, any specialized cells. The scientific research community believes that the transplanted stem cells may be able to regenerate dead or dying human tissue, reversing the progress of disease. According to Cure, a coalition of 28 groups representing patients with cancer, Parkinson's, paralysis and other maladies, "no research in recent history has offered as much hope" for cures.
Support for stem-cell research comes not just from pro-choice Democrats like Al Gore but also from Republicans who have concluded, in the words of former Senator Bob Dole, that supporting such research is "the pro-life position to take."
The list includes Republican senators like Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, John McCain of Arizona, Connie Mack of Florida and Pete Domenici of New Mexico. Even Senator Gordon Smith of Oregon, who the National Right to Life Committee says voted "the right way" on abortion every time last year, supports the research. His family has experience with the ravages of Parkinson's disease, and he has concluded, "Part of my pro-life ethic is to make life better for the living."
This is the real compassionate conservatism. One hopes that between now

and next Tuesday, Mr. Bush will explain to those of us with debilitating diseases indeed, to all of us why it is more pro-life to throw away stem cells than to put them to work saving lives.
Michael J. Fox, the actor, is active in organizations working to combat Parkinson's disease.

<x-sigsep><p></x-sigsep>

-

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

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

608-262-5015 (tel)
608-262-5485 (fax)

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

</html>

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