

1 37

AUSTRALIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

OCKHAM'S RAZOR

JULY 1996

THE CHALLENGE OF THE HUMAN GENOME PROJECT

The Hon Justice Michael Kirby AC CMG

AUSTRALIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

OCKHAM'S RAZOR

JULY 1996

THE CHALLENGE OF THE HUMAN GENOME PROJECT

The Hon Justice Michael Kirby AC CMG*

It is a little more than forty years since the great scientists
Watson and Crick revolutionised our knowledge of genetics and
changed forever our understanding of living things. In their
paper published in April 1953 to the scientific journal *Nature* they
announced the outcome of their research which showed that all of
the genes are about a hundred thousand genes. Hidden away on the
DNA double helix are the genes which carry the markers which tell
us whether we will grow to be tall, have blue eyes or manifest other
genetic characteristics and diseases that will affect our life's
course and, perhaps, predict its end.

*Justice of the High Court of Australia. Member of the
UNESCO International Bioethics Committee, Paris. Member
of the Ethics, Law and Social Issues Committee of the
Human Genome Organisation, Bethesda. Formerly Chairman
of the Australian Law Reform Commission. Personal views.

Combined with the remarkable capacity of information technology to isolate, analyse, test and describe these markers, we now reached the brink of truly amazing developments in genetic research and therapy of great importance to animals and also to humans.

Kath Walker, the great Australian Aboriginal poet, who referred to the name of Ogeroo of the Nunuccal described more than my words can how all of us are hostage to the past and the traditions from whom we are derived:

"Let no-one say the past is dead
The past is all about us and within
Haunted by tribal memories, I know this little now
This accidental present is not the all of me
Whose long making is so much of the past."

Most people have only the dimmest idea of the double helix structure described by Watson and Crick, or of the 100,000 genes and the 3.3 billion base pairs which affect and define what we look like, how we feel and live and, to a large extent, who we are. I confess that I do not fully understand the mysteries of genetics. But I do know that it is about time that we all came to be informed about the directions of genetic research. They promise enormous opportunities of medical therapy. But they also pose the most puzzling dilemmas for morality, society and the individual. We cannot leave these puzzles to scientists alone. Hard as it is, we must face up to the dilemma of the genes.

Already genetic research is isolating many of the 5,000 or more genetic diseases which arise from single gene defects as well as more complex polygenic traits. We live in hope that genetic research will identify and help us to cure (and to prevent) many serious and painful inherited conditions which, until now, have afflicted humanity and been resistant to treatment or cure. Time seems to go by but scientists somewhere in the world announce that they have isolated the marker which signals the presence of a cancer or other genetic conditions. Clearly, the first step on the path to medical attention to such conditions, even if one of them is serious and even potentially fatal, is identification of the errant gene. Find it, and you are on the way to gene therapy in this generation and, possibly, manipulation to extrude or modify the offending gene, in future generations.

I became interested in the double helix and its messages. I attended a conference in Bilbao, Spain in 1993 to mark the 50th anniversary of the famous letter announcing DNA. The conference was specifically addressed to the legal and ethical questions presented by genomic research. Judges and lawyers from many parts of the world examined some of the implications of the new research presented:

How do we protect the confidentiality of genetic information? Does such data belong to the individual or to

the family and relatives who may also be affected by its contents?

Does proof of a genetic propensity to violence help to exculpate the criminal who may be merely acting out a genetic pre-disposition? To what extent must our criminal law revise its postulate of free will as the foundation for criminal responsibility?

Should scientists be able to obtain patents upon segments of the map of the human genes known as the genome - even before they have identified the significance of the markers on that map for particular characteristics or medical conditions? Or should the genome belong to all humanity being a gift of God or a heritage to us all?

Should employers and insurers be entitled to conduct intensive genomic investigations to reveal the potential risks which may be incurred in the distant future by the employee or the insured?

Should a person be entitled to refuse to unlock his or her genetic future, preferring to live in happy ignorance of genetic disorders rather than to take the risk of melancholy discoveries?

How should we control manipulation of animal and human genes? Are there risks which we cannot yet predict in interfering with the germ-line by which genetic messages are

from one generation to the next? Four Nobel Laureates at the Bilbao conference urged a complete moratorium on genetic manipulation of future generations. They said that scientists just do not know enough about their potential irrevocably to alter characteristics which are the product of millennia of natural development. In times of pestilence and plague it has been the very diversity of the gene pool which has protected humanity from destruction. Keep it like that for the moment, they urged;

One may be content to permit, and even encourage, the genetic search which is finding the markers for muscular dystrophy, cystic fibrosis, "fragile-x" syndrome in babies, various forms of melanoma, breast cancer, Alzheimer's and Parkinson's Disease and the latest: the propensity to nicotine addiction. But what about baldness? Or obesity? Or programming out perceived flaws on beauty? If the deafness marker were found and eliminated, might we possibly lose a Beethoven? If the blindness marker were found and removed, would we lose a Milton? The great Gustav Mahler suffered from a genetic heart disorder which ultimately claimed his life at 51. Yet before he died he left us heirs to his immortal music. How many great spirits of the past, and the present, would have been eliminated (if that option were available) on discovery of the so-called "gay gene": identifying propensity to homosexuality? Is this quest for genetic "perfection" simply the latest twist in eugenics - achieving by science a stereotype of humanity that even the Nazi doctors could not procure?

Australia such fine scientists such as Sir Gustav Nossal have urged us to resist irrational fears about science-fiction in the future. He points to the marvellous potential of genetic research to reduce the pain and suffering that come from so many inherited diseases. So indeed we should. But the lesson of history is that science fiction all too soon becomes tomorrow's reality. We must begin thinking and working now towards the answers to the legal and social dilemmas which genetic research presents. These are not matters for scientists alone. Because they touch the future of our species, they are matters for society - for us. If society speaks with clear and principled guidance, the natural openness of scientists will be largely unrestrained by law or custom. Already there are reports of human-animal hybridisation involving the fertilisation with human sperm of polcat eggs as part of research into male infertility. There has even been *in vitro* fertilisation of chimpanzee eggs with human spermatozooids, although interrupted at early stages. A framework of rules is required. It will not come about by ignoring the difficult issues and putting blind faith in the decisions of government funding bodies and scientific laboratories. In areas which affect our genetic makeup, humanity has a legitimate right to be heard. We must find the ways to ensure that the voice is heard -

The Human Genome Organisation ("HUGO"), with its main office in Bethesda, near Washington in the United States of America, is coordinating the work of scientists all over the world in mapping

of human genes and identifying the billions of markers with
 yet, mostly, unrevealed secrets. This is the greatest
 scientific endeavour in history. It is bigger by far than the
 Project which produced another scientific phenomenon of
 the century, nuclear fission. This year, an Australian, Professor Grant
 of Adelaide, has been elected President of HUGO. In
 for the first time, HUGO will convene its annual meeting in
 Professor Sutherland will preside.

have been elected to the Ethics, Law and Social Issues
 of HUGO. More recently I have been appointed to the
 International Bioethics Committee. The latter is preparing an
 to lay down international law for the global regulation of
 research. The Director-General of UNESCO has asked me to
 this convention to the HUGO conference in October. When
 people criticise the growth and influence of international
 consider how painfully inadequate the law of any single
 would be to deal, unaided, with the problems presented by
 research such as is now occurring under the umbrella of

We are on the brink of a new millennium where the map of
 genes will be completed. This will become the encyclopaedia for
 in the centuries ahead. Whether it becomes a completely
 controlled experiment or advances to the benefit of humanity within
 which humanity itself sets, is the big question which soon we

answer

Most of the issues which distract our political life and
problems in Australia pale into utter insignificance in comparison to
importance, urgency and difficulty of the problems presented by
genomic research. But who is looking into those problems?
nobody. Of the mega-bucks which hang on genetic patents,
much is devoted to the ethical, legal and social questions?
a trickle. The Human Genome Project will overwhelmingly
humanity. But humanity must pay attention to the ethical,
and social issues which it brings in its train. At stake is nothing
but the definition of what humanity will be like in the next
century. It is time that we in Australia began to be aware of the
issues which the Human Genome Project presents and to build
policies which, in harmony with those of other land, will help to
solve those dilemmas.

"Let no-one say the past is dead
The past is all about us and within."