



Recombinant Molecules: Impact on Science and Society

Tenth Miles
International
Symposium

Edited by
Roland F. Beers, Jr.
Edward G. Bassett

Raven Press

Recombinant Molecules: Impact on Science and Society

*Miles International Symposium Series
Number 10*

Editors:

Roland F. Beers, Jr., M.D.,
Ph.D.

*Miles Laboratories, Inc.
Elkhart, Indiana*

Edward G. Bassett, Ph.D.

*Miles Laboratories, Inc.
Elkhart, Indiana*

Raven Press ■ New York

Raven Press, 1140 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036

© 1977 by Raven Press Books, Ltd. All rights reserved. This book is protected by copyright. No part of it may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Made in the United States of America

Main entry under title:

Recombinant molecules.

(Miles international symposium series; no. 10)
Proceedings of the 10th Miles international
symposium held at the Massachusetts Institute of
Technology and sponsored by Miles Laboratories.
Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Genetic recombination--Congresses. 2. Genetic
engineering--Congresses. 3. Genetic engineering--
Social aspects--Congresses. I. Beers, Roland R. II.
Bassett, Edward Graham, 1927- III. Miles Laboratories,
inc., Elkhart, Ind. IV. Series. [DNLM: 1.
Recombination, Genetic--Congresses. W3 M1543 no. 10
1976 / QH443 R311 1976]

QH443.R4 575.2 76-5675
ISBN 0-89004-131-8

Preface

One of the major events in the history of biological research occurred when it was found that excised segments of genetic material (DNA) from two different species could be annealed *in vitro* to form a hybrid DNA molecule which, on reintroduction into the cell, could impose entirely new genetic controls on that cell. The technology that enables the molecular basis of gene expression and heredity to be established, while providing a foundation for the creation of new organisms with desired genetic characteristics, has evoked a serious concern among scientists and laymen. This concern emanates from the theoretic creation of unique forms of agents of infection (or those adversely affecting the environment) whose biological properties cannot be completely predicted.

To provide a vehicle for a discussion of the scientific and societal ramifications of this technology, Miles Laboratories, Inc. sponsored the Tenth Miles International Symposium held at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Actively participating and sharing views during this conference were involved scientists from all over the world. These proceedings are the papers delivered at this 3-day conference.

The editors extend grateful thanks to Frank E. Young, M.D., Ph.D., Chairman of the Program Committee, and to members of that Committee who also chaired individual sessions. Acknowledgment is also given to Walter A. Compton, M.D., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Miles Laboratories, Inc., whose interest and encouragement have made these symposia a traditional annual event.

We are grateful to the authors for assisting in the prompt publication of this volume. Within the time allowed for editing, it was not possible for each discussant to review his remarks; if error or misinterpretation of the discussions has resulted, the editors take full responsibility.

Roland F. Beers, Jr.
Edward G. Bassett

Contributors

Laura Alexander

*Department of Microbiology
Institute of Dental Research
University of Alabama, Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama 35294*

David Baltimore

*Center for Cancer Research
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139*

Roland F. Beers, Jr.

*Miles Laboratories, Inc.
Elkhart, Indiana 46514*

Paul Berg

*Department of Biochemistry
Stanford University School of
Medicine
Stanford, California 94305*

Mary Betlach

*Department of Biochemistry and
Biophysics
University of California,
San Francisco
San Francisco, California 94143*

Frederick R. Blattner

*Laboratory of Genetics
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706*

Ann E. Blechl

*Laboratory of Genetics
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706*

Francisco Bolivar

*Department of Biochemistry and
Biophysics
University of California,
San Francisco
San Francisco, California 94143*

Herbert W. Boyer

*Department of Biochemistry and
Biophysics
University of California,
San Francisco
San Francisco, California 94143*

Winston J. Brill

*Department of Bacteriology
College of Agricultural and
Life Sciences
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706*

H. Bursztyn-Pettegrew

*Department of Genetics
Stanford University School
of Medicine
Stanford, California 94305*

Felipe Cabello

*Department of Medicine
Stanford University School
of Medicine
Stanford, California 94305*

John Carbon

*Department of Biological Sciences
University of California
Santa Barbara, California 93106*

Peter S. Carlson

*Department of Crop and Soil Science
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824*

Annie C. Y. Chang

*Department of Medicine
Stanford University School of
Medicine
Stanford, California 94305*

M.-D. Chilton

*Department of Microbiology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195*

Josephine E. Clark

*Department of Microbiology
Institute of Dental Research
University of Alabama, Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama 35294*

Louise Clarke

*Department of Biological Sciences
University of California
Santa Barbara, California 93106*

Edward C. Cocking

*Department of Botany
University of Nottingham
Nottingham, NG7 2RD England*

Stanley N. Cohen

*Department of Medicine
Stanford University School of
Medicine
Stanford, California 94305*

Roy Curtiss, III

*Department of Microbiology
Institute of Dental Research
University of Alabama, Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama 35294*

Edward C. Dart

*Bioscience Group, Corporate
Laboratory
Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd.
Runcorn, Cheshire, England*

Dana Davoli

*Department of Biological Chemistry
Harvard Medical School
Boston, Massachusetts 02115*

Igor B. Dawid

*Department of Embryology
Carnegie Institute of Washington
Baltimore, Maryland 21210*

M. Drummond

*Department of Microbiology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195*

Craig Duncan

*Department of Microbiology
University of Rochester
Rochester, New York 14642*

Argiris Efstratiadis

*Biological Laboratories
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138*

S. D. Ehrlich

*Institut de Biologie Moleculaire
Faculté de Science
Paris 75005, France*

Stanley Falkow

*Department of Microbiology and
Immunology
University of Washington School of
Medicine
Seattle, Washington 98195*

George C. Fareed

*Department of Microbiology and
Immunology and
Molecular Biology Institute
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90024*

David Figurski

*Department of Biology
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093*

Stephen P. Goff

*Department of Biochemistry
Stanford University School of
Medicine
Stanford, California 94305*

Raúl Goldschmidt

*Department of Microbiology
Institute of Dental Research
University of Alabama, Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama 35294*

Howard M. Goodman

*Department of Biochemistry and
Biophysics
University of California, San Francisco
San Francisco, California 94143*

M. P. Gordon

*Department of Biochemistry
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195*

David J. Grunwald

*Laboratory of Genetics
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706*

Dean H. Hamer

*Laboratory of Molecular Genetics
National Institute of Child
Health and Human Development
National Institutes of Health
Bethesda, Maryland 20014*

Donald R. Helinski

*Department of Biology
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093*

Vickers Hershfield

*Department of Microbiology
Duke University Medical Center
Durham, North Carolina 27710*

Herbert L. Heyneker

*Department of Biochemistry and
Biophysics
University of California, San Francisco
San Francisco, California 94143*

J. Charles Hsu

*Department of Microbiology
Institute of Dental Research
University of Alabama, Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama 35294*

Sheila C. Hull

*Department of Microbiology
Institute of Dental Research
University of Alabama, Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama 35294*

Christine Ilgen

*Department of Biological Sciences
University of California
Santa Barbara, California 93106*

Matsuhisa Inoue

*Department of Microbiology
Institute of Dental Research
University of Alabama, Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama 35294*

Leon Jacobs

*Office of Collaborative Research
National Institutes of Health
Bethesda, Maryland 20014*

Laurence H. Kedes

*Department of Medicine
Stanford University School of
Medicine
Palo Alto, California 94305*

J. Lederberg

*Department of Genetics
Stanford University School of
Medicine
Stanford, California 94305*

Seymour Lederberg

*Division of Biology and Medicine
Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island 02912*

Larry J. Maturin, Sr.

*Department of Microbiology
Institute of Dental Research
University of Alabama, Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama 35294*

Georg Melchers

*Max-Planck-Institut für Biologie
74 Tübingen, West Germany*

D. Merlo

*Department of Microbiology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195*

Richard J. Meyer

*Department of Biology
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093*

A. Montoya

*Department of Microbiology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195*

Robert Moody

*Department of Microbiology
Institute of Dental Research
University of Alabama, Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama 35294*

David D. Moore

*Laboratory of Genetics
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706*

John F. Morrow

*Department of Biological Chemistry
Harvard Medical School
Boston, Massachusetts 02115*

Kenneth Murray

*Department of Molecular Biology
University of Edinburgh
Edinburgh EH9 3JR, Scotland*

Noreen E. Murray

*Department of Molecular Biology
University of Edinburgh
Edinburgh EH9 3JR, Scotland*

Daniel Nathans

*Department of Microbiology
Johns Hopkins University School of
Medicine
Baltimore, Maryland 21205*

E. W. Nester

*Department of Microbiology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195*

Alexander L. Nussbaum

*Boston Biomedical Research Institute
Boston, Massachusetts 02114*

Dennis A. Pereira

*Department of Microbiology
Institute of Dental Research
University of Alabama, Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama 35294*

Michel Perricaudet

*Department of Molecular Biology
Institut Pasteur
75015 Paris, France*

Ulf Pettersson

*Department of Microbiology
The Wallenberg Laboratory
Uppsala University
75277 Uppsala, Sweden*

Lennart Philipson

*Department of Microbiology
The Wallenberg Laboratory
Uppsala University
75277 Uppsala, Sweden*

Barry Ratzkin

*Department of Biological Sciences
University of California
Santa Barbara, California 93106*

Thomas B. Rice

*Plant Genetics Group
Pfizer Central Research
Groton, Connecticut 06340*

Brian M. Richards

*Molecular Biological Research
Laboratories
G. D. Searle & Co.
High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire,
England*

Mark H. Richmond

*Department of Bacteriology
University of Bristol
Bristol BS8 1TD, England*

Richard J. Roberts

*Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory
Cold Spring Harbor, New York 11724*

Raymond L. Rodriguez

*Department of Biochemistry and
Biophysics
University of California,
San Francisco
San Francisco, California 94143*

James W. Schumm

*Laboratory of Genetics
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706*

D. Sciaky

*Department of Microbiology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195*

V. Sgaramella

*Laboratorio di Genetica Biochemica
ed Evoluzionistica, C.N.R.
27100 Pavia, Italy*

John Shine

*Department of Biochemistry and
Biophysics
University of California,
San Francisco
San Francisco, California 94143*

Magdalene So

*Department of Microbiology and
Immunology
University of Washington School of
Medicine
Seattle, Washington 98195*

I. Stroynowski

*Department of Genetics
Stanford University School of Medicine
Stanford, California 94305*

Waclaw Szybalski

*McArdle Laboratory for Cancer
Research
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706*

Natalie M. Teich

*Imperial Cancer Research Fund
Laboratories
Lincoln's Inn Fields
London WC2A 3PX, England*

Charles A. Thomas, Jr.

*Department of Biological Chemistry
Harvard Medical School
Boston, Massachusetts 02115*

Kenneth Timmis

*Max-Planck-Institut für
Molekulare Genetik
1 Berlin 33 (Dahlem), West Germany*

Pierre Tiollais

*Department of Molecular Biology
Institut Pasteur
75015 Paris, France*

John Tooze

*European Molecular Biology
Organization
6900 Heidelberg 1, West Germany*

Frances R. Warshaw

*The Group on Genetics and Social
Policy
Boston Area Science for the People
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139*

Robin A. Weiss

*Imperial Cancer Research Fund
Laboratories
Lincoln's Inn Fields
London WC2A 3PX, England*

Peter K. Wellauer

*Swiss Cancer Research Institute
1011 Lausanne, Switzerland*

Bill G. Williams

*Laboratory of Genetics
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706*

Gary A. Wilson

*Department of Microbiology
University of Rochester
Rochester, New York 14642*

Frank E. Young

*Department of Microbiology
University of Rochester School of
Medicine and Dentistry
Rochester, New York 14642*

John M. Wozney

*Department of Biological Chemistry
Harvard Medical School
Boston, Massachusetts 02115*

Contents

1. Introduction <i>Roland F. Beers, Jr.</i>	1
Section A: Technological Advances	
2. Introduction to Section <i>Frank E. Young</i>	5
3. The Construction of Molecular Cloning Vehicles <i>Herbert W. Boyer, Mary Betlach, Francisco Bolivar, Raymond L. Rodriguez, Herbert L. Heyneker, John Shine, and Howard M. Goodman</i>	9
4. The Role of Restriction Endonucleases in Genetic Engineering <i>Richard J. Roberts</i>	21
5. Development of the <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> Model System for Recombinant Molecule Technology <i>Frank E. Young, Craig Duncan, and Gary A. Wilson</i>	33
6. Biological Containment: The Subordination of <i>Escherichia coli</i> K-12 <i>Roy Curtiss, III, Dennis A. Pereira, J. Charles Hsu, Sheila C. Hull, Josephine E. Clark, Larry J. Maturin, Sr., Raúl Goldschmidt, Robert Moody, Matsuhisa Inoue, and Laura Alexander</i>	45
7. Use of the T4 Ligase to Join Flush-Ended DNA Segments <i>V. Sgaramella, H. Bursztyn-Pettegrew, and S. D. Ehrlich</i>	57
8. Cloning of the Thymidylate Synthetase Gene of the Phage Phi-3-T <i>S. D. Ehrlich, H. Bursztyn-Pettegrew, I. Stroynowski, and J. Lederberg</i>	69
9. Discussion <i>Frank E. Young</i>	81
Section B: Development of Plasmid Vectors	
10. Introduction to Section <i>Stanley Falkow</i>	89
11. DNA Cloning as a Tool for the Study of Plasmid Biology <i>Stanley N. Cohen, Felipe Cabello, Annie C. Y. Chang, and Kenneth Timmis</i>	91

12. Molecular Cloning as a Tool in the Study of Pathogenic <i>Escherichia coli</i> <i>Magdalene So and Stanley Falkow</i>	107
13. Expression of Bacterial Genes in Phage Lambda Vectors <i>Noreen E. Murray</i>	123
14. Safety of Coliphage Lambda Vectors Carrying Foreign Genes <i>Waclaw Szybalski</i>	137
15. Construction and Properties of Plasmid Cloning Vehicles <i>Donald R. Helinski, Vickers Hershfield, David Figurski,</i> <i>and Richard J. Meyer</i>	151
16. Discussion <i>Stanley Falkow</i>	167

Section C: Practical and Potential Developments in Plant Genetics

17. Introduction to Section <i>E. W. Nester</i>	177
18. Search for Bacterial DNA in Crown Gall Tumors <i>E. W. Nester, M.-D. Chilton, M. Drummond, D. Merlo,</i> <i>A. Montoya, D. Sciaky, and M. P. Gordon</i>	179
19. Genetics of Nitrogen Fixation: Some Possible Applications <i>Winston J. Brill</i>	189
20. Plant Protoplast Fusion: Progress and Prospects for Agriculture <i>Edward C. Cocking</i>	195
21. Plant Hybrids by Fusion of Protoplasts <i>Georg Melchers</i>	209
22. Genetic Engineering and Crop Improvement <i>Peter S. Carlson and Thomas B. Rice</i>	229
23. Discussion <i>E. W. Nester</i>	239

Section D: Virus Vectors

24. Introduction to Section <i>Daniel Nathans</i>	247
25. Making Use of Coliphage Lambda <i>Kenneth Murray</i>	249

26. Construction and Testing of Safer Phage Vectors for DNA Cloning <i>Bill G. Williams, David D. Moore, James W. Schumm, David J. Grunwald, Ann E. Blechl, and Frederick R. Blattner</i>	261
27. Propagation of a Fragment of Adenovirus DNA in <i>Escherichia coli</i> after Covalent Linkage to a Lambda Vector <i>Pierre Tiollais, Michel Perricaudet, Ulf Pettersson, and Lennart Philipson</i>	273
28. Construction of Hybrid Viruses Containing SV40 and Lambda Phage DNA Segments and Their Propagation in Cultured Monkey Cells <i>Stephen P. Goff and Paul Berg</i>	285
29. Cloning of a Segment from the Immunity Region of Bacteriophage λ DNA in Monkey Cells <i>George C. Fareed, Dana Davoli, and Alexander L. Nussbaum</i>	299
30. SV40 Carrying an <i>Escherichia coli</i> Suppressor Gene <i>Dean H. Hamer</i>	317
31. Discussion <i>David Baltimore</i>	337
Section E: Cloning of Eukaryotic DNA	
32. Introduction to Section <i>Charles A. Thomas, Jr.</i>	353
33. The Construction and Use of Hybrid Plasmid Gene Banks in <i>Escherichia coli</i> <i>John Carbon, Louise Clarke, Christine Ilgen, and Barry Ratzkin</i>	355
34. Organization of Members Within the Repeating Families of the Genes Coding for Ribosomal RNA in <i>Xenopus laevis</i> and <i>Drosophila melanogaster</i> <i>Peter K. Wellauer and Igor B. Dawid</i>	379
35. The Application of Recombinant DNA Cloning for the Analysis of Sea Urchin (<i>Strongylocentrotus purpuratus</i>) Histone Genes <i>Laurence H. Kedes</i>	399
36. Studies on the Silk Fibroin Gene <i>John F. Morrow, John M. Wozney, and Argiris Efstratiadis</i>	409
37. Discussion <i>Charles A. Thomas, Jr.</i>	419

Section F: Societal Impact – Issues and Policies

38. Introduction to Section
Kenneth Murray 425

39. *Escherichia coli* K-12 and Its Use for Genetic Engineering Purposes
Mark H. Richmond 429

40. The Role of the National Institutes of Health in Rulemaking
Leon Jacobs 445

41. Emerging Attitudes and Policies in Europe
John Tooze 455

42. Beware the Lurking Virogene
Natalie M. Teich and Robin A. Weiss 471

43. The Least Hazardous Course: Recombinant DNA Technology as an Option for Human Genetic, Viral, and Cancer Therapy
Seymour Lederberg 485

44. Industrial Risk Analysis
Edward C. Dart 495

45. A Real Situation
Brian M. Richards 497

46. Gene Implantation: Proceed with Caution. Reservations Concerning Research in Recombinant DNA
Frances R. Warshaw 501

47. Discussion
Kenneth Murray 515

Appendix
 Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant DNA Molecules 525

Epilogue 531

Index 533

1. Introduction

Roland F. Beers, Jr.

Miles Laboratories, Inc., Elkhart, Indiana 46514

One of the original purposes for establishing the annual Miles symposium series was to follow and record the evolution of the science of molecular biology into a technology of molecular biology. The intellectual tour de force of twentieth century biology had taken place: the discovery of the structural basis for genetic transfer from one generation to the next and the beginning of an understanding of possible mechanisms for translating genetic information to somatic structure and function. The double helix of DNA and the genetic code for amino acids formed the basis for the central dogma of molecular biology in 1967, the year of the first Miles symposium on the subject of messenger RNA. Today's symposium is a clear recognition of the fact that molecular biology is on the threshold of becoming a technology.

Nevertheless, even though the current status of molecular biology has been the expectation of both the scientist and the public supporting him, there is today a growing feeling of uneasiness and outright fear of this new technology, a concern that received its first major public recognition at the now famous Asilomar conference in February, 1975. The immediate issue, like that of the first nuclear chain reaction, is the uncertainty of the potential for what is popularly referred to as genetic engineering. Four technologies from molecular recombinant research with decreasing probability of success and increasing lag time until success is achieved appear to me to be:

1. genetic modification of microbial organisms for the purpose of increasing the quality and quantity of a desired microbial product such as an enzyme;
2. genetic modification of higher plant organisms to increase their productivity with respect to yield, caloric and nutritional content, and the special challenge of developing cereal having symbiotic relationships with nitrogen-fixing microorganisms;
3. transfer of animal (mammalian) genomes to microorganisms for the synthesis of specific proteins or hormones such as insulin; and
4. genetic transformation of somatic cells to correct genetic defects such as sickle cell anemia or phenylketonuria through transformation

of the cells *in vitro* or *in vivo* with virus vectors. The risks of harmful consequences to man and his environment appear to increase in the same order.

The analogy with nuclear physics is not inappropriate, but the uncertainties of potential for risks appear to be greater than those predicted or encountered after the first successful nuclear chain reaction. The threat of nuclear technology was initially identified as a human threat, that is, deliberate use of the technology for destructive purposes. Later, with the advent of nuclear power generation, the risks of errors in judgment or accident received the major emphasis. The primary emphasis of risks in molecular recombinant research is addressed to errors of judgment and accident. This places the issue of risks in a slightly different ethical framework.

Most of the discussions and deliberations held in the past and continued in this volume have been concerned with the mechanisms by which society reaches decisions for minimizing the risks and then establishing standards of conduct to implement those decisions. Some thought has been given to the appropriateness of the goals and benefits to be accrued from molecular recombinant research, although the motivations behind these goals are highly diversified. It is appropriate at this time to reflect on the philosophical ramifications of this new technology with special attention given to proper historical perspective. So revolutionary is this new technology that there is a tendency to consider it a unique event in history without precedent. In fact, there is a precedent that has run throughout the entire history of mankind and should be examined in terms of society's attitude toward and response to the uncertainties of any new technology that threatens to alter traditional beliefs and status quo or promises to bring forth a new utopia. This social environment in which the molecular recombinant research is carried out should be recognized and understood by the practitioners of research and by those who control and support this research. It should also be recognized by those groups in society who assume an adversary position with respect to decisions for goals and their implementation by society.

Two elements of society's attitude and response that strike me as significant are (a) an anti-intellectual attitude and (b) an unjustified expectation that the new technology can be used to solve major problems of society without concurrent institutional and behavioral reforms. I use the term intellectual to identify the rational activities of the human mind as distinguished from any philosophical interpretation of what is intellectual or nonintellectual.

Man's response to uncertainty generated by knowledge is recorded in biblical times in the first few chapters of Genesis. Knowledge provides the basis for control over the present and the future, that is, power. Yet, because knowledge is often incomplete, so is the power it provides, hence the source of the uncertainty. Indeed, the incompleteness of that power has led to the

creation of the major religions of the world. Depending on one's religious convictions, man either created or discovered a transcendental Being to compensate or make allowances for the incompleteness of his own knowledge and power. Intercession in man's behalf has been sought through supplication and ritualistic sacrifices, a form of power bargaining. Inevitably, this struggle for certainty through power developed a strong ethical character that eventually became highly legalistic in its interpretation and enforcement. The key ethical component that is today as important as at the time of Genesis is the assignment and acceptance of the moral responsibility for the possession of that power.

Two major institutions of civilization evolved in parallel and inevitable conflict. In broad terms, one is religious or transcendental, the other is intellectual or scientific. Each proclaimed itself as the authority for the ultimate source of knowledge, and each asserted its right to use that knowledge in its quest for power and certainty. The boundary of these two areas has, of course, shifted dramatically during the last 200 years in favor of the intellectually based institutions: science and technology.

However, the struggle over the authority for power and the responsibility for the use of that power still remains a major struggle today. Indeed, the dilemma facing mankind is an imponderable paradox: absolute power controlled by either of these institutions contains the seeds of destruction not only of civilization but of man, the species. Authoritarian institutions are on the increase worldwide. The transcendental Being may not be recognized as such, but any ideology whose power resides in its position of authority provides the basis for governing a society as if a transcendental Being existed and was not accountable to the critical intellectual processes of man. On the other hand, the imperfect state of man's knowledge and, hence, his capacity to predict and control his future is equally dangerous if this limitation is not clearly recognized by society. Scientism is the ideology that does not recognize those limitations.

The struggle today is not over the ownership of the source of knowledge but rather over the assignment of the responsibility for the use of that knowledge. Perhaps the clearest example of this is seen in the current posture of the Roman Catholic Church toward the goals and methods of controlling the size of the human population. Underlying its refusal to sanction a technological solution is the explicit premise that the responsibility for meeting this problem cannot be given to man. In other words, whatever conclusions man may reach regarding the need for controlling populations and the immediate as well as long-term means for meeting that need, the authority to assume this responsibility and, therefore, the power to implement the means are *de facto* denied to man.

This is an extreme case of what has become during the last half of the twentieth century a growing threat to the assertion that the human mind through its intellectual processes can indeed be the basis for man's assum-