

To: Lapp/Tyroler, Quadri-Science HQ
From: J. Lederberg

Dec. 1, 1961

Some notes on Quadri-Science objectives and means.
Could these be passed on to our associates?

We should be careful ~~to~~ not to underestimate the impact that Q/S may have on American industry, which should be to inject the same leverage of scientific insight that is now uniquely held by financial specialists. This implies a responsibility to look beyond immediate profitability, and not to confuse our functions with that of ~~an~~ a CFC. I would then draw the following inferences of procedure and caution.

Take special care that Q/S is not merely used as a front to the public, or to a management.

Insist ~~on~~ on substantial responsibility for Q/S in a company's affairs, either through stock exchange or, more generally, the nomination of a director. The explicit role that Q/S can put forward ~~is~~ is to furnish scientific direction at the level of the Board of Directors of a company, with provision for the additional scientific support that may be needed for effective operation. (This would not preclude preliminary studies of a management-consultation type, if the reporting is directly to top management levels). We should specifically avoid direct consultation obligations to a lower hierarchical level, where the advice will almost consistently be ignored.

Not to spend too much time on smaller companies of limited impact, unless they have a unique opportunity to fill an important requirement (the Institute for Scientific Information would be in that category). Q/S might seek, however, to catalyze the recombination of some small new companies with large ones that need technical re-direction.

We might want to be particularly watchful for immoral or frivolous industries -- e.g. tobacco -- which could be diverted to more constructive roles if we could find ways to unlock them from their plant investment. (Tobacco is an especially pertinent example: the handwriting must be on the wall, and if one company can be shown the way out, there might be a stampede thereafter. The public health might then be saved some of its present insult, with its vicious cycle of advertising sustenance.) A psychological factor of 'bad conscience' might play a surprising role here. Some other examples: cosmetics, soft drinks. (I know the psychological factor operates strongly in television, but I haven't the foggiest idea how to give it any still profitable sublimation.) (This suggests we might not do too badly to have some advice ourselves from a symbol-oriented psychologist!)

The main point I want to make is the advantage of having one success out of a great many attempts at some really large-scale affiliations.

We probably should not be so explicit in the technological fields of Q/S interest, since other important opportunities may be expected to arise outside the 4 indicated ones.

In the brochure, I can't help but feel that the reference to the Nobel prizes lacks somewhat in dignity (though I did approve the present copy); in approaches to the biggest fish, a softer sell might be even more effective.

~~WXX~~ We will certainly have to enlarge the list of our associates, and we should have in mind several additional people that we know we can call on for specific requirements.

I can name several friends and colleagues whom, I am confident, I could name as potential resources in preliminary discussions with other principals. We should make a point of cultivating the interest of such people, as far as ~~possible~~^{possible} arranging for all of us to know them too. The ones I would name would, I think, merely rely on our arranging fair compensation for them on the merits of any specific assignment-- to the point, at any rate, where we could bring up their names in preliminary talks. For the present, I would mention:

Carl Djerassi Professor of Organic Chemistry at Stanford. (one time V.P. for Research, and still a Director, Syntex Corporation) One of the topnotch organic chemists in the country. Close connections with Charles Allen & Co. (I am sure Mr. Allen would be fascinated by Q/S!)

Hilary Koprowski Director of the Wistar Institute (Cell Biology), Univ of Pa. An outstanding virologist and cancer biologist. Formerly a director of research at Lederle. (He has produced a type III live polio vaccine that is unquestionably superior to Sabin's, but is locked up for some petty political reasons in the IHS).

Elliott Levinthal Res. Associate in Instrumentation (exobiology) at Stanford. Has 10 years successful experience in industrial management (having sold off Levinthal Electronics Labs. to Radiation Inc.) before returning to academic life. Would also have personal access to venture capital.

If the current discussions in California don't preclude it, there are two very large companies that, for different reasons, could unquestionably benefit from our participation: Studebaker-Packard and Lockheed. (As a rather hasty judgment, I would think they would do very well to merge themselves!) Is there any way to look more deeply into such possibilities?

Ferguson