

J. MICHAEL BISHOP

Enemies of Promise

NOT LONG AGO I discovered that the on-board diagnostic system of my new vehicle will let me know via a "Check Engine" light when I haven't screwed the gas cap on tight enough to prevent fumes from polluting the atmosphere. The computer discovers the problem not by monitoring a crude switch on the gas cap itself but by checking the entire combustion process and searching for irregularities. Anomalies—even momentary ones—detected this way are stored in the computer's memory so a technician can fix them later. The technology in my car is almost as wondrous as that of the Internet, which enables me to converse with people anywhere in the world; or consider the science that produced an asthma medication that enables me to play racquetball without carrying an inhaler. As you might suspect, I'm not in the camp of those who denigrate science or criticize technological change.

I do understand the fears of the Luddites, who yearn for a world less chemically reprocessed and technologically demanding. But I also think that many who criticize science today have either short memories or little historical sense, which is why I wanted to share "Enemies of Promise" by J. Michael Bishop (b. 1936), a professor of microbiology and Chancellor at the University of California, San Francisco, and winner of the Nobel Prize. He warns that the misperceptions many people have about science could have serious consequences for all Americans. The piece is also a fine example of an expert writing clearly to an audience of nonspecialists—something scientists will have to do more often if faith in science is to be restored.

"Enemies of Promise" appeared originally in my favorite magazine, the *Wilson Quarterly* (Summer 1995), a publication of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

We live in an age of scientific triumph. Science has solved many of nature's puzzles and greatly enlarged human knowledge. And the fruits of scientific inquiry have vastly improved human welfare. Yet despite these proud achievements, science today is increasingly mistrusted and under attack.

Some of the opposition to science comes from familiar sources, including religious zealots who relentlessly press for the mandatory teaching of creationism in the public schools. It is discouraging to think that more than a century after the publication of Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859), and seventy years after the Scopes trial dramatized the issue, the same battles must still be fought. But fight them we must.

Other antagonists of science are less familiar. Strange though it may seem, there is within academe a school of thought that considers science to be wholly fraudulent as a way of knowing. According to these "postmodernists,"

the supposed
structed fictio
by other mean
looks at the m
what it is: arra

Science
human existen
insights to off
belief that the n
knowledge. A
belief, they mus
people have al

But scie
the words of p
world works.
the nature of s
whole." But w
solve the myst
tasks of human

In the a
of science are
view of scienc
ment in paroc
now I am alar
academy, by o

Consider
writer and stat
the ethos of s
tematically lea
and, of course.

Those ar
anger is eviden
rationalism] ha
abyss begins."

Even som
good friends to
Thanks in part
(D.-Calif.), wh
been shaken. F
pansion of fur
problems. He i
the problems o

the supposedly objective truths of science are in reality all “socially constructed fictions,” no more than “useful myths,” and science itself is “politics by other means.” Anyone with a working knowledge of science, anyone who looks at the natural world with an honest eye, should recognize all of this for what it is: arrant nonsense.

Science, of course, is not the exclusive source of knowledge about human existence. Literature, art, philosophy, history, and religion all have their insights to offer into the human condition. To deny that is scientism—the belief that the methods of the natural sciences are the only means of obtaining knowledge. And to the extent that scientists have at times indulged in that belief, they must shoulder some of the blame for the misapprehensions that some people have about science.

But science does have something inimitable to offer humankind: it is, in the words of physician-author Lewis Thomas, “the best way to learn how the world works.” A postmodernist poet of my acquaintance complains that it is in the nature of science to break things apart, thereby destroying the “mysterious whole.” But we scientists take things apart in order to understand the whole, to solve the mystery—an enterprise that we regard as one of the great, ennobling tasks of humankind.

In the academic medical center where I work, the efficacy and benefits of science are a daily reality. So when I first encountered the postmodernist view of science some years ago, I dismissed it as either a strategy for advancement in parochial precincts of the academy or a display of ignorance. But now I am alarmed because the postmodernist cry has been joined, outside the academy, by other strong voices raised against science.

Consider these lines from Václav Havel, the widely admired Czech writer and statesman, who has vigorously expressed his disenchantment with the ethos of science: “Modern rationalism and modern science . . . now systematically leave [the natural world] behind, deny it, degrade and defame it—and, of course, at the same time, colonize it.”

Those are angry words, even if their precise meaning is elusive. And anger is evident, too, in Havel’s main conclusion: “This era [of science and rationalism] has reached the end of its potential, the point beyond which the abyss begins.”

Even some influential men who know science well and who have been good friends to it in the past have joined in the chorus of criticism and doubt. Thanks in part to Havel’s ruminations, Representative George E. Brown, Jr. (D.-Calif.), who was trained as a physicist, reports that his faith in science has been shaken. He complains of what he calls a “knowledge paradox”: an expansion of fundamental knowledge accompanied by an increase in social problems. He implies that it shouldn’t be that way, that as science progresses, the problems of society should diminish. And he suggests that Congress and

the "consumers" of scientific research may have to take more of a hand in determining how science is conducted, in what research gets funded.

A similar critique has been made by former Colorado governor Richard Lamm. He claims no longer to believe that biomedical research contributes to the improvement of human health—a truly astonishing stance. To validate his skepticism, he presents the example of the University of Colorado Medical Center. It has done "little or nothing," he complains, about increasing primary care, expanding medical coverage to the uninsured, dealing with various addictions and dietary excesses, and controlling violence. As if biomedical research, or even academic medical centers, had either the resources or the capabilities to do what Lamm desires!

The source of these dissatisfactions appears to be an exaggerated view of what science can do. For example, agitation within Congress may induce the National Science Foundation to establish a center for research on violence, but only the naive would expect a quick fix for that momentous problem. Three-quarters of a century after the death of the great German sociologist Max Weber (1864–1920), the social and behavioral sciences have yet to produce an antidote for even one of the common social pathologies. The genesis of human behavior entails complexities that still lie beyond the grasp of human reason.

Critics such as Brown and Lamm blame science for what are actually the failures of individuals or society to use the knowledge that science has provided. The blame is misplaced. Science has produced the vaccines required to control many childhood infections in the United States, but our nation has failed to deploy properly those vaccines. Science has sounded the alarm about acid rain and its principal origins in automobile emissions, but our society has not found the political will to bridle the internal combustion engine. Science has documented the medical risks of addiction to tobacco, yet our federal government still spends large amounts of money subsidizing the tobacco industry.

These critics also fail to understand that success in science cannot be dictated. The progress of science is ultimately driven by feasibility. Science is the art of the possible, of the soluble, to recall a phrase from the late British immunologist and Nobel laureate Sir Peter Medawar. We seldom can force nature's hand; usually, she must tip it for us.

Nor is it possible, especially in the early stages of research, to anticipate what benefits are likely to result. My own experience is a case in point. In 1911, Peyton Rous at the Rockefeller Institute in New York City discovered a virus that causes cancer in chickens, a seemingly obscure observation. Yet 65 years later, that chicken virus was the vehicle by which Harold Varmus and I, and our colleagues, were able to uncover genes that are involved in the genesis of human cancer. The lesson of history is clear: the lines of inquiry that may prove most fruitful to science are generally unpredictable.

Biologists had some decision given him a good things had nothing, and nothing. 'Don't worry a year you will have ing such a report

The great expectations about eradicated by more effective the common co

When will alchemists demned by criticism and AIDS to produce a rem Institutes of Health promise, rewards

I cannot imagine his description of assisted the NIH have always been demands rigor as we originality, and I with sorrow that M Biomedical research has unearthed usable national leadership ing. I wonder how business in the way

The bitter outcome in the 1992 film *Lorenzo's Oil* close-minded, and remedies as a waste case of Lorenzo Odone cripples many neurological Offered no hope parents scoured the administration of two of the skepticism of p

Biologist John Tyler Bonner has whimsically recalled an exchange he had some decades ago with the National Science Foundation, which had given him a grant for a research project. "After the first year, I wrote that things had not worked out very well—had tried this, that, and the other thing, and nothing had really happened. [The foundation] wrote back, saying, 'Don't worry about it—that is the way research goes sometimes. Maybe next year you will have better luck.'" Alas, no scientist today would think of writing such a report, and no scientist today could imagine receiving such a reply.

The great successes of science have helped to create the exaggerated expectations about what science can accomplish. Why has malaria not been eradicated by now? Why is there still no cure for AIDS? Why is there not a more effective vaccine for influenza? When will there be a final remedy for the common cold? When will we be able to produce energy without waste? When will alchemy at last convert quartz to gold?

When scientists fail to meet unrealistic expectations, they are condemned by critics who do not recognize the limits of science. Thus, playwright and AIDS activist Larry Kramer bitterly complains that science has yet to produce a remedy for AIDS, placing much of the blame on the National Institutes of Health (NIH)—"a research system that by law demands compromise, rewards mediocrity and actually punishes initiative and originality."

I cannot imagine what law Kramer has in mind, and I cannot agree with his description of what the NIH expects from its sponsored research. I have assisted the NIH with peer review for more than twenty years. Its standards have always been the same: it seeks work of the highest originality and demands rigor as well. I, for one, have never knowingly punished initiative or originality, and I have never seen the agencies of the NIH do so. I realize with sorrow that Mr. Kramer is unlikely to believe me.

Biomedical research is one of the great triumphs of human endeavor. It has unearthed usable knowledge at a remarkable rate. It has brought us international leadership in the battle against disease and the search for understanding. I wonder how all this could have been accomplished if we scientists did business in the way that Kramer and critics like him claim that we do.

The bitter outcry from AIDS activists over the past decade was echoed in the 1992 film *Lorenzo's Oil*, which portrays medical scientists as insensitive, close-minded, and self-serving, and dismisses controlled studies of potential remedies as a waste of precious time. The film is based on a true story, the case of Lorenzo Odone, a child who suffers from a rare hereditary disease that cripples many neurological functions and leads at an agonizing pace to death.

Offered no hope by conventional medical science, Lorenzo's desperate parents scoured the medical literature and turned up a possible remedy: the administration of two natural oils known as erucic and oleic acid. In the face of the skepticism of physicians and research specialists, Lorenzo was given the

oils and, in the estimation of his parents, ceased to decline—perhaps even improved marginally. It was a courageous, determined, and even reasoned effort by the parents. (Mr. Odone has since received an honorary degree from at least one university.) Whether it was effective is another matter.

The movie portrays the treatment of Lorenzo as a success, with the heroic parents triumphant over the obstructionism of medical scientists. The film ends with a collage of parents testifying that the oils had been used successfully to treat Lorenzo's disease in their children. But it fails to present any of the parents who have tried the oils with bitter disappointment. And, of course, all of this is only anecdotal information. Properly controlled studies are still in progress. To date, they have not given much cause for hope.

Meanwhile, as if on cue, medical scientists have since succeeded in isolating the damaged gene responsible for the rare disease. Thus, the stage is set for the development of decisive clinical testing and effective therapy (although the latter may be long in coming).

If misapprehensions abound about what science can and cannot do, so do misplaced fears of its hazards. For more than five years now, my employer, the University of California, San Francisco, has waged a costly battle for the right to perform biomedical research in a residential area. For all intents and purposes, the university has lost. The opponents were our neighbors, who argued that we are dangerous beyond tolerance; that we exude toxic wastes, infectious pathogens, and radioactivity; that we put at risk the lives and limbs of all who come within reach—our own lives and limbs included, I suppose, a nuance that seems lost on the opposition. One agitated citizen suggested in a public forum that the manipulation of recombinant DNA at the university had engendered the AIDS virus; another declared on television her outrage that "those people are bringing DNA into my neighborhood."

Resistance to science is born of fear. Fear, in turn, is bred by ignorance. 25 And it is ignorance that is our deepest malady. The late literary critic Lionel Trilling described the difficulty well, in words that are even more apposite now than when he wrote them: "Science in our day lies beyond the intellectual grasp of most [people]. . . . This exclusion . . . from the mode of thought which is habitually said to be the characteristic achievement of the modern age . . . is a wound . . . to our intellectual self-esteem . . . a diminution of national possibility . . . a lessening of the social hope."

The mass ignorance of science confronts us daily. In recent international testing, U.S. high school students finished ninth in physics among the top twelve nations, eleventh in chemistry, and dead last in biology. Science is poorly taught in most of our elementary and secondary schools, when it is taught at all. Surveys of adult Americans indicate that only a minority accepts evolution as an explanation for the origin of the human species. Many do not even know that the Earth circles the Sun. In a recent committee hearing, a prominent member of Congress betrayed his ignorance of how the prostate gland differs from the testes.

Accountants, laborers upon science with bew

Do even we sci of a Russian satellite t of large areas of Siberi are taking away the la wondered what physic tire human genome an

Writing an article I labored mightily to m journalists, laity of every the manuscript to a solid manuscript came back w around the staff here. N

Robert M. Hazen *Approach* (1994), tell of between DNA and RN never heard of plate te string theory had some examples; we should als ture, what can we right

Lionel Trilling kn method of instruction h sciences . . . to those stud tery and especially endo perplexing to our educat entists, bewildering and v

We scientists can r always been ours to solve physicist and historian o women "who do not kn functioning, and surrou real sense, not sane. We pushed out of the comm must not become our hic

The enterprise of sc standing in a universe that as "infinite in all directions small." We of science hav increasing power, a metho consequence, we are admi hope for the future but als science seems large, but to

Accountants, laborers, lawyers, poets, politicians, and even many physicians look upon science with bewilderment.

Do even we scientists understand one another? A few years ago, I read of a Russian satellite that gathers solar light to provide constant illumination of large areas of Siberia. "They are taking away the night," I thought. "They are taking away the last moments of mystery. Is nothing sacred?" But then I wondered what physicists must think of biologists' hopes to decipher the entire human genome and perhaps recraft it, ostensibly for the better.

Writing an article about cancer genes for *Scientific American* some years ago, I labored mightily to make the text universally accessible. I consulted students, journalists, laity of every stripe. When these consultants all had approved, I sent the manuscript to a solid-state physicist of considerable merit. A week later, the manuscript came back with this comment: "I have read your paper and shown it around the staff here. No one understands much of it. What exactly is a gene?"

Robert M. Hazen and James Trefil, authors of *The Sciences: An Integrated Approach* (1994), tell of twenty-three geophysicists who could not distinguish between DNA and RNA, and of a Nobel Prize-winning chemist who had never heard of plate tectonics. I have encountered biologists who thought string theory had something to do with pasta. We may be amused by these examples; we should also be troubled. If science is no longer a common culture, what can we rightfully expect of the laity by way of understanding?

Lionel Trilling knew where the problem lay in his time: "No successful 30 method of instruction has been found . . . which can give a comprehension of sciences . . . to those students who are not professionally committed to its mastery and especially endowed to achieve it." And there the problem lies today: perplexing to our educators, ignored by all but the most public-minded of scientists, bewildering and vaguely disquieting to the general public.

We scientists can no longer leave the problem to others. Indeed, it has always been ours to solve, and all of society is now paying for our neglect. As physicist and historian of science Gerald Holton has said, modern men and women "who do not know the basic facts that determine their very existence, functioning, and surroundings are living in a dream world . . . are, in a very real sense, not sane. We [scientists] . . . should do what we can, or we shall be pushed out of the common culture. The lab remains our workplace, but it must not become our hiding place."

The enterprise of science embodies a great adventure: the quest for understanding in a universe that the mathematician Freeman Dyson once characterized as "infinite in all directions, not only above us in the large but also below us in the small." We of science have begun the quest well, by building a method of ever-increasing power, a method that can illuminate all that is in the natural world. In consequence, we are admired but also feared, mistrusted, even despised. We offer hope for the future but also moral conflict and ambiguous choice. The price of science seems large, but to reject science is to deny the future.

QUESTIONING THE TEXT

1. Have you ever encountered the attitude toward science that Bishop describes as *postmodern*? If so, explain this notion of science as a set of "socially constructed fictions" (paragraph 3). Share your work with classmates, and explore the difference between science as a useful fiction and science as an ennobling fact.
2. Are there any words, concepts, or examples in "Enemies of Promise" that you don't understand? Based on Bishop's text, how would you characterize his intended readership?
3. What is J.R.'s attitude toward scientific progress as demonstrated in his introduction? How does the introduction influence your reading of Bishop's "Enemies of Promise"?

MAKING CONNECTIONS

4. On the Internet, explore a Usenet group or listserv that discusses scientific issues. Follow a discussion or controversy for several days, and then write a paragraph reporting on it.
5. Victor Frankenstein, in Mary Shelley's selection from *Frankenstein* (p. 274), describes this way his rejection of the monster that he had created: "I felt the bitterness of disappointment; dreams that had been my food and pleasant rest for so long a space were now become a hell to me; and the change was so rapid, the overthrow so complete!" (paragraph 14). Does the rejection of science in our time as described by Bishop reflect disappointment and bitterness that we have not created the technological Utopia that once seemed just over the horizon? Freewrite on this subject, and then write a position paper on this question: has science today become Dr. Frankenstein's monster?

JOINING THE CONVERSATION

6. Write a 200-word summary or abstract of "Enemies of Promise" for readers who might not have time to study the entire piece.
7. Choose an example of a scientific or technological change that has occurred in the last hundred years; read about it in the library, using at least three different sources, and then write an evaluation of that change.
8. Examine a technology that you believe has caused more problems than it has solved, and write an essay in which you propose a solution to at least one of those problems. Trace the cause of the problem in the technology—is it a problem in the science, in social attitudes, in politics, or something else?