

The Ideas of Ludwik Fleck and Their Application to the Eukaryotic Cell Cycle, the Restriction Point, and G1-phase Control

Stephen Cooper

Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Michigan Medical School

Ann Arbor Michigan 48109-0620

e-mail: cooper@umich.edu

Abstract

The ideas of Ludwik Fleck (1896-1961) analyzing the conservative nature of scientific ideas are discussed and applied to the proposed G1-phase restriction point as a regulatory element of the mammalian cell cycle. Fleck proposed that ideas become fixed and difficult to change because criticisms of current and dominant models are either ignored or turned to support of the current model. The idea of a thought-collective leading to the stability of ideas is a central theme of the ideas of Ludwik Fleck.

Evidence conforms to conceptions just as often as conceptions conform to evidence.

Ludwik Fleck, 1935

Introduction

The continuum model of eukaryotic cell-cycle control is now almost 25 years old^(1,2). This alternative view was actually generated a number of years earlier based on studies of the bacterial cell cycle⁽³⁾. Since its first proposal, the continuum model has not made much headway against what may be called the G1-phase control model of the cell cycle, a model that is current, dominant, and accepted by a broad consensus of researchers in the field of eukaryotic cell-cycle studies. It is important to understand how the G1-phase control model has remained so dominant despite the success of the alternative continuum model view of the cell cycle in explaining myriad published experimental results on the cell cycle. No matter how successful the experimental work confirming and supporting the continuum model, and no matter how many articles explaining and applying this alternative viewpoint have been published, there appears to be no change in the way people talk about, perceive, or understand, the control of the eukaryotic cell cycle.

Why it is so difficult to effect a change in the consensus viewpoint? Why is the currently dominant view of cell-cycle control impervious to the strongest criticism? Is it because the current model is right? Is it because the alternative analysis has not been clear or strongly presented? Is it because not enough allies have been enlisted to study and explain the alternative viewpoint?

Recently a friend [Dr. Lawrence Sturman, Head of the Watson Laboratories of the New York State Health Department in Albany, and a friend since Graduate School] gave me a copy of a small book with a strange title, written by a person whose name was unknown to me. The book was by Ludwik Fleck, a deceased physician of Polish origin, who thought a lot about why scientific ideas are recalcitrant to change. This book suddenly illuminated the problem, and explained why it is so difficult to displace a widely held idea, even if that idea may be incorrect. As will be seen below, Ludwik Fleck codified and described the processes whereby incorrect theories or ideas persist and are rendered resistant to change or modification. Some of Fleck's concepts are presented here in order to explain why dominant ideas are so resistant to change and resistant to criticism. The ideas of Fleck will be discussed in the context of a controversy over a well-known and important proposal regarding the control of the eukaryotic cell cycle—the restriction point in the G1-phase of the mammalian cell cycle.

Meeting Ludwik Fleck

Ludwik Fleck is most well known today, if one knows him at all, for his book, "Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact. This book was published originally in German in 1935 ⁽⁴⁾ and remained relatively unknown—the original printing was merely 640 printed copies and only 200 of these were sold—until it was republished under the urging and mentorship of Thomas Kuhn, who is famous for his seminal book, "Structure of Scientific Revolutions." The English version of Fleck's book was published in 1979 ⁽⁵⁾ with a translation from the original German by Fred Bradley and Thaddeus J. Trenn, with additional editing by Trenn and Robert K. Merton.

Fleck died in Israel in 1961, having emigrated there from his native Poland after World War II. One may ask, “What can Ludwik Fleck contribute to the study of the mammalian cell cycle, since most of our current ideas on the cell cycle are of recent vintage and were developed years after Fleck’s book was published as well as years after Fleck’s death?” How can Fleck’s ideas, published in 1935, be applied to the cell cycle as these ideas were written well before there was any understanding or knowledge of even the most basic concepts of the cell cycle, such as the existence of different cell-cycle phases. The discussion of the cell cycle presented below is therefore merely a vehicle to illustrate how Fleck’s analysis may be applied to a particular scientific debate.

To anticipate the conclusion of this presentation of Fleck’s work, the explanation of the difficulty of changing ingrained ideas are not rooted in science, or experiments, or even theories, but are related more to the sociology and psychology of science and thought. This concept will be explained using as an example one simple but problematic aspect of cell cycle control, the restriction point. By concentrating on this simple idea, I hope to disseminate, and perhaps popularize, some of Fleck’s most relevant ideas.

The title of Fleck’s book, “Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact” ^(4,5) (hereafter referred to as GDSF) is somewhat odd. How can a “fact” develop? Aren’t facts solid and immutable? As one commentator is reported saying (from Thomas Kuhn’s forward to the translated edition ⁽⁵⁾), “How can such a book be? A fact is a fact. It has neither genesis nor development.” What Fleck presented in his book is a discussion of the way in which scientific facts do “develop” and change over time. The scientific “fact” that Fleck discussed in his book is the development of ideas regarding the nature of syphilis, and in particular how the Wasserman test affected these ideas. The book is a

masterful study of the historical development of ideas regarding what syphilis was, how it could be recognized, and how, during the 1920's, the Wasserman test, despite numerous problems and confusions, led to an understanding of the nature of syphilis.

Some of Fleck's ideas will be applied to the mammalian cell cycle in order to show the relevance of his ideas to science today. Fleck's analysis is used as a point of reference to understand why a particular idea regarding the cell cycle persists in the collective thought of the field of cell cycle studies, despite, as discussed below, this idea is very likely incorrect.

Who was Ludwik Fleck?

Ludwik Fleck lived through one of the major tragedies of our time, World War II and the associated Holocaust. Fleck was born in Lvov, Poland, on the 11th of July, 1896. The German language still dominated the educational system due to the origins of Lvov (previously known as Lemberg) as a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Fleck received his medical degree in 1922 from Lvov University. A succession of positions studying typhus and bacteriological problems led Fleck to the study of methods for the diagnosis of infectious disease. In 1927 he was in Vienna working at the State Serotherapeutic Institute. The following year he became head of the bacteriological laboratory of the Social Sick Fund in Lvov until his dismissal in 1935, a result of anti-Jewish measures. [These biographical notes are a short summary of the biographical sketch of Ludwik Fleck given at the end of the University of Chicago edition of "Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact," Fleck's major work.]

Fleck's main area of research was the development of therapeutic sera and diagnostic skin tests. His studies on epidemic typhus fever for which he developed a diagnostic skin test (the exanthin reaction) were internationally confirmed and are mentioned in textbooks.

Besides studies in medical science, Fleck developed an original theory about the thought style of science and "thought collectives" which are fully described in GDSF. This book was completed in 1934, and published in 1935 in Switzerland ⁽⁴⁾ because political conditions in 1935 did not allow a Jew to publish in Germany. The book, despite low sales, was widely discussed and reviewed in journals in Poland, Germany, France, Italy, and Switzerland.

Among his scientific contributions following the publication of this book was the development of a new method to strengthen the sensitivity of the Wasserman reaction. Fleck also discovered an original method for distinguishing true serological reactions from pseudoreactions. The "fact" discussed in his book relates to the historical development of understanding syphilis and how the Wasserman reaction led to the basic understanding of the etiology and development of this infectious disease.

Fleck's work prior to the commencement of World War II was located in Lvov, which was taken over by Russia. Lvov is now within the borders of Ukraine. Fleck was director of the City Microbiological Laboratory, and was on the teaching staff of the microbiology department of the State Medical School in Lvov. Until 1941 he also served as head of the microbiology department of the State Bacteriological Institute in Lvov.

During the German occupation of Lvov starting in 1941, Fleck was director of the bacteriological laboratory of the Jewish Hospital. In 1942 Fleck and his family were arrested and he was forced to produce his newly developed typhus vaccine (developed in 1942) for the German armed forces. He was subsequently deported to the Nazi concentration camp in Auschwitz. At the camp, under duress, Fleck continued to produce his vaccine for the German army. In 1944 Fleck was transferred to Buchenwald and again ordered to prepare typhus vaccine.

The nightmare of World War II and his incarceration in concentration camps ended for Fleck on the 11th of April, 1945, when the United States Army liberated Buchenwald. Fleck then returned to Poland where, from October 1945, he served as assistant professor of Microbiology and head of the Institute of Microbiology in the newly founded Marie Curie Skłodowska University of Lublin. He also organized a microbiology research institute and in August 1947 became Associate Professor of Microbiology.

During the 1947-1949 period Fleck discovered a new phenomenon related to inflammation, “leukergy”, and Fleck and his students soon published about 40 articles on this phenomenon. This discovery had an immediate impact on the scientific community and in 1949 Fleck received the scientific prize of the city of Lublin for his research in leukergy. In addition to his scientific studies, during the 1948 Nuremberg trials Fleck was asked to render assistance to the prosecution in the case of Krauch, *et al.*

From June 1950, Fleck was a full Professor of Microbiology at Lublin until his appointment in 1952 as director of the Department of Microbiology and Immunology at

the Mother and Child State Institute in Warsaw. He was awarded, in 1953, the State Scientific Prize of Poland for his research on epidemic typhus fever. He was also elected a member of the Polish Academy of Sciences in 1954, and in 1955 he was awarded the highest scientific degree in Poland, a Doctorate of Medical Science. In that year he was invited to the Pasteur Institute in Paris as well as the Medical School in Strassburg to lecture on leukergy. In 1956 he was invited to a conference on autoantibodies at the University of Texas.

In 1957 Fleck emigrated to Israel. His only son, Arieh (Ryszard in Polish) had lived there since 1947. Although he had tried to emigrate since the end of the war, it was only in 1957 that he was allowed to leave Poland in such a way that he could take his wife, Ernestina, with him. After leaving Poland he joined the Israel Institute for Biological Research at Ness-Ziona as head of the Section of Experimental Pathology.

In addition to the monograph discussed here (GDSF), Fleck had published over 130 scientific articles in Polish, German, Hebrew, English, French, and Russian. He was a member of many international scientific societies, including the New York Academy of Sciences, the International Haematological Society, and the International Society of Microbiologists.

Fleck had Hodgkin's disease and was seriously ill by the beginning of 1961. Fleck died on the 5th of June, 1961 and was buried in Ness-Ziona.

In recent years there has been a rebirth of study of the ideas of Ludwik Fleck, with many symposia, meetings, and conferences discussing these ideas. In addition, there

is a Ludwik Fleck Prize offered annually by the Society for Social Studies of Science for a book related to the study of ideas.

The history of “Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact”

The currently available English translation of Ludwik Fleck’s monograph, ”Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact” ⁽⁵⁾ is largely the result of efforts by Thomas Kuhn to bring the original work (published in German) to a wider audience. In the Foreword to the translated edition, Kuhn writes that he had encountered only two people who had read this book aside from himself, and one of them, the renowned mathematician Mark Kac, was a personal friend of Fleck. Kuhn notes that he read this book some time during the years 1949-1950. Kuhn specifically points out that two or three years earlier, before encountering Fleck, he had had his own personal epiphany regarding the historicity of scientific understanding. Kuhn’s contribution was directed primarily to understanding the occasional non-cumulative episodes that permeate scientific history and which have been called scientific revolutions. During these years when Kuhn’s ideas were developing, it was the serendipitous encounter with a minor footnote in Hans Reichenbach’s book, “Experience and Prediction”, that led him to Ludwik Fleck.

Thus, while Fleck was not instrumental in the genesis of Kuhn’s ideas (after all, Kuhn was writing about extreme changes in scientific ideas, while Fleck concentrated on why ideas are resistant to change), Fleck’s treatment of a particular area of scientific development was actually very supportive of the Kuhnian analysis. Between revolutions in scientific views it is the conservative nature of science that dominates, and it is this

that is analyzed by Fleck. Thus Fleck's ideas certainly deserve some recognition as part of a new analysis of the nature of the development of scientific ideas.

Kuhn read the book in its original German. Even with his limited language ability, Kuhn drew from Fleck's discussion the key idea that "fact" cannot be rendered completely free from "point of view." One of Fleck's main proposals is that scientific facts cannot be understood without considering the then current mode of thinking or other societal modes of analysis. As an example, in a society where everything in life is associated with the will of "the Gods", it would be natural to analyze particular events in nature (e.g., illness) as related to "the will of the gods". The understanding of nature, as revealed by scientific study, is therefore deeply related to the overall thought structure of the society in which the analysis is taking place.

On the "Tenacity of Systems of Opinion"

It is well accepted, due to the work of Thomas Kuhn, that scientists congregate around a generally accepted idea or set of opinions that allow them to work together as a group, to communicate ideas within the group, and to develop new ideas based on the common foundational understanding of the group. In Kuhn's terminology, this common understanding is the "paradigm" within which normal science proceeds. Fleck's contribution to this history is not merely a presaging of the concept that commonly accepted ideas are stable and resistant to criticism or alteration, but more important, Fleck proposed *why* these ideas are stable and resistant to change. As Fleck saw the development of ideas, contradictions raised against the consensus are not only repelled by the current and consensus viewpoint, but these contradictions may even be enlisted as

support of an incorrect idea. Rather than a discarding of ideas in the face of contradictory evidence, the ideas may actually be reinforced in the face of the contradictions.

Rather than simply suggesting that even the most objective scientists are subject to inertia or even immobility when core beliefs are challenged, the prescient work of Fleck listed clearly described reasons why there is such a resistance to change or such a protection of the commonly or generally held central idea. As Fleck pointed out, this resistance to change is not merely the result of simple passivity or laziness or even mistrust of new ideas; after all, scientists and intellectuals speak again and again of new and exciting ideas. Rather, what Fleck pointed out was that resistance to change results from an active process that reacts to the criticism.

Fleck denoted four stages in this reaction. It is easiest to get the directness and flavor of Fleck's writing by a direct quote from his book ⁽⁵⁾:

Once a structurally complete and closed system of opinions consisting of many details and relationship has been formed, it offers enduring resistance to anything that contradicts it.

A striking example of this tendency is given by our history of the concept of "carnal scourge" [i.e., syphilitic lesions due to sexual activity] in its prolonged endurance against every new notion. What we are faced with here is not so much simple passivity or mistrust of new ideas as an active approach which can be divided into several stages. (1)

A contradiction to the system appears unthinkable. (2) What does not fit into the system remains unseen; (3) alternatively, if it is noticed, either it is kept secret, or (4) laborious efforts are made to explain an exception in terms that do not contradict the system. (5) Despite the legitimate claims of contradictory views, one tends to see, describe, or even illustrate those circumstances which corroborate current views and thereby give them substance.

I will now discuss some aspects of the cell cycle and the study of the cell cycle that illustrate how ideas that are problematic or wrong are protected and stabilized against criticism.

On the tenacity of the “restriction point”

The restriction point was postulated to exist by Pardee on the basis of a series of experiments described in 1974 ⁽⁶⁾. The restriction point was proposed as a unique cell-cycle point at which cells come to rest when cells are growth arrested either by starvation or inhibition. Subsequent applications of the restriction point phenomenon have enlarged its meaning to include a cell-cycle point from which arrested cells that are allowed to grow will now form a synchronized culture. The original paper has been cited in thousands of papers, as have many subsequent papers on this phenomenon. But this success at citation does not begin to measure the true impact of the paper. The restriction point has entered that rarified realm of acceptance where no reference is needed, just as today one does not have to cite Watson/Crick when discussing DNA structure or activity.

Thus, vast numbers of papers that have cells cease growing and increase the number of cells with a G1-phase amount of DNA, describe those cells as being arrested at the “restriction point.” All papers that arrest cells “in G1 phase”, or in G1/G0”, or in “G0” are examples of arrest at a restriction point.

Although the notion of a restriction point is now almost 30 years old, theoretical and experimental arguments and analyses have been presented that point out that the restriction point does not exist⁽⁷⁻¹⁰⁾. One may rightly ask how can we know that these arguments critical of the restriction point model are correct. Of course, it is not possible to argue for the absolute truth of these contrarian ideas. But what is clear is that none of the ideas critical of the restriction point concept (and related ideas) has ever been refuted, challenged, disproven, contradicted, or even argued against. Rather, these ideas critical of the restriction point have been generally ignored. I will not review and restate arguments that have been made in numerous papers and supported by numerous experiments; I leave it to the readers of this article to investigate the prior publications. Rather, here the important object of the discussion will be to explore why, given that the restriction point is an anthropomorphic construct with a problematic provenance, the restriction point persists as a phenomenon, the restriction point is not critically examined, the restriction point persists as a method to synchronize cells, and the restriction point persists as a widely accepted element of cell-cycle control.

The restriction point was proposed to exist at a time when the G1 phase was believed to be the location of the key controlling elements of the cell cycle. This concept was based on numerous papers showing that the G1 phase was the most variable phase, and that the longer a cell’s interdivision time, the longer the G1 phase^(2,11). The simple

interpretation developed from this general observation was that the faster a cell could complete its G1-phase control functions, the faster a cell would pass through the division cycle. Slow passage through G1 phase produced a slow growing cell, and fast passage through G1 phase produced a fast growing cell.

Within this intellectual milieu the restriction point fit well as the first identified element in the G1-phase control system. There were other positive aspects of the restriction point model that led to its ready acceptance. On a scientific and applied level, having a single unique “restriction point” made it conceivable to be able to control cell growth (i.e., cancer cell growth) by regulating passage through the singular “restriction point.”

Some particularly sociological and humanistic factors also helped. At the time of the proposal of the restriction point Arthur Pardee was famous as a biochemist, bacterial physiologist, bacterial geneticist, and molecular biologist. He had participated in a number of famous discoveries such as the mechanism of feedback inhibition and the pattern of control of enzyme synthesis. When Pardee proposed the restriction point, his well-deserved fame contributed to the ready acceptance of the restriction point proposal. It should also be considered that the logical organization of the original restriction point proposal, along with a rigorous style of analysis that was borrowed from bacterial genetics, led to the immediate acceptance by cell biologists of the restriction point. One should not fault Pardee for this immediate and uncritical incorporation of the restriction point into the canon of cell-cycle control phenomena. It was the combination of the well-known abilities of Pardee along with the seductive aspect of the discovery of a unique control point that led to the acceptance of the restriction point. The fame of Pardee,

through no fault of his own, allowed many in the field of cell-cycle studies to accept Pardee's work without critical analysis. It was only many years later that any critique of the restriction point was presented ⁽⁹⁾.

In retrospect, the restriction point phenomenon was interpreted in a completely different way on the basis of experiments with bacteria carried out a few years earlier ^(12,13). The postulated bacterial restriction point(s) were shown to be a result of leakage and not due to any biologically existing "restriction point." Besides experimental work undermining the original proposal of two bacterial restriction points (although they were not called "restriction points"), criteria were proposed for the identification of such restriction points ⁽¹²⁾. To briefly recapitulate the bacterial analysis, it was proposed that the restriction point is a result of leakage during growth inhibition. Given that no inhibition protocol is perfect, cells closer to the start of S phase will initiate S phase even during a period of inhibition of mass increase. That is because cells closer to S phase require less of additional synthesis to reach some proposed initiation mass or trigger amount in order to initiate S phase. Cells further from S phase require more accumulation during the inhibition period. Experiments with bacteria showed that as the degree of inhibition was varied continuously over a wide range, there was a continuous variation in the fraction of cells able to initiate S phase. Thus, either there were an infinite number of "restriction points" or the restriction point phenomenon was due to leakage.

One of the most fundamental problems when explaining an experimental result with a general model is that if only one possibility is presented or considered, it easily appears as if the given explanation is the only explanation. In contrast, if a particular

experiment is presented as trying to decide between two different models, at least one or the other could be excluded as being less acceptable as an explanation of the experimental results. Because the bacterial experiments were not widely known, particularly among researchers studying eukaryotic cells, the relationship of the critique of bacterial restriction points to the eukaryotic restriction point proposal went unnoticed.

Thus we see an application of Fleck's first dictum, that a contradiction to the system appears unthinkable. At a more practical level of scientific thinking, it is not that alternatives are truly "unthinkable"—as all of the alternative ideas are able to be verbalized and visualized without much trouble—but rather that the satisfactory and immediate fit of the restriction point model within the then current and dominant view of G1-phase control of the cell cycle did not allow further exploration of alternatives. In a sense the initial proposal blinded researchers to alternative explanations. In this sense, the alternative ideas were invisible, and thus unthinkable. The initial "fit" of the restriction point concept to the early data excluded the search for alternative explanations. If the bacterial model were well known (which it wasn't) then further experiments might have been performed (e.g., varying conditions of starvation, checking for leakage in growth arrest, etc.) that could have led to a critical examination of the restriction point model.

One of the ironies of the history of the restriction point in animal cells is that the original postulation of the restriction point emphasized the conclusion that the restriction point is unique. It was the uniqueness of the restriction point (i.e., different arrest conditions arrested cells at the same point) that gave the original postulation its great power. Today, no matter what cells are being studied, when "arrest at a restriction point" is proposed to occur, it is merely assumed that it is the unique "restriction point"

proposed by Pardee that is the point at which these cells are now arrested. Whether the cells are aardvark cells or zebra cells, there is no further analysis to demonstrate that one particular restriction point is the same as the restriction point in other cells.

In any case, following the proposal of the restriction point there were many extensions of the restriction point hypothesis. A specific isoleucine restriction point was found, and other restriction points were reported to exist ⁽¹⁴⁻¹⁷⁾. Of course, none of these findings were ever put in terms of weakening the restriction point hypothesis. The idea might have been that if the world loved and applauded one restriction point, then the world would love other restriction points just as well. Of course the multiplicity of such points should have been taken as an indication that the bacterial model is a better explanation of the restriction point phenomenon and that there was, in actuality, no restriction point. The multiplicity of restriction points would thus be explained as being related to the relative “leakage” associated with each type of arrest condition.

This multiplicity of restriction points fits in with Fleck’s second rule, that “...what does not fit into the system remains unseen.” It is not that the proliferation of restriction points was not seen, but it was not seen as a contradiction to the basic idea of a unique restriction point. If there are many restriction points, then any one experiment describing arrested cells being at a “restriction point” should note which one of the many points the restriction occurs. Thus the third proposal is also followed here, where the problems with the method are kept secret and ignored.

An even more egregious problem was evident in the original Pardee paper where the cells released from growth arrest were actually known and reported to be

unsynchronized. This was evident from the very broad time of initiation of S phases upon regrowth of cells. This phenomenon has disappeared from consideration. Thus the very basic experiments that led to the original proposal of the restriction point were not supportive of the restriction point idea.

The fourth proposal, that “...laborious efforts are made to explain an exception in terms that do not contradict the system...” is evident in explanations of why cells described as “synchronized” do not exhibit synchronized divisions or even synchronized patterns of DNA contents. This troubling experimental fact is dismissed with the explanation that one would not expect to see discreet synchronous divisions because of the variability of interdivision times of mammalian or eukaryotic cells. Recent experiments from the laboratory of Charles Helmstetter⁽¹⁸⁻²⁰⁾ on cells synchronized with the eukaryotic membrane-elution method (“baby machine”) show that this proposal is inadequate. Mammalian cells can be synchronized by selection to produce a culture that exhibits a number of clear synchronized divisions (Fig. 2). It is far better to conclude from the absence of synchronized divisions or the absence of synchronized passage through DNA patterns of the cell cycle that the cells are not synchronized and the cells are not arrested at a restriction point.

Thought Collectives and the Tenacity of Scientific Opinion

The other major conceptual contribution of Fleck is the concept of a “thought collective” (*Denkkollegative*) or a “thought community” (*Denkgemeinschaft*). A thought collective is not related to an enforced belief system, but is rather a descriptive term

describing the common views held voluntarily by a group of scientists regarding the fundamental beliefs of the group.

It is the thought collective that may be considered most closely related to the “paradigm” model of Thomas Kuhn. A paradigm that describes or regulates a particular field of study is the belief system within which “normal” science proceeds. New ideas are added to the paradigm and the paradigm is enlarged over time. But there is no change in the basic paradigm stemming from these new ideas. Revolutions in science occur, according to Kuhn, when the then current paradigm is unable to account for results that challenge the basic paradigm.

Thus a Kuhnian paradigm is essentially conservative, as it conserves the foundational and fundamental belief systems of the scientific group. Similarly, Fleck’s thought collective is conservative because only by keeping ideas relatively invariant and constant can communication between its members be facilitated. If the ideas of a scientific field were always in flux, communication would be both difficult and confusing. But it is this conservative aspect that prevents critical ideas that undermine the current belief system from being given a full hearing. As Fleck ⁽⁵⁾ so presciently wrote (in GDSF):

Besides such fortuitous and *transient* thought collectives there are *stable* or comparatively stable ones [italics in GDSF]. These form particularly around organized social groups. If a large group exists long enough, the thought style becomes fixed and formal in structure.

Practical performance then dominates over creative mood, which is reduced to a certain fixed level that is disciplined, uniform, and discreet. This is the situation in which contemporary science finds itself as a specific, thought-collective structure [*denkkollektives Gebilde*].

And later on Fleck continues:

...A special feeling of dependence therefore dominates all communication of thought within a collective. The general structure of a thought collective entails that *the communication of thoughts within a collective, irrespective of content or logical justification, should lead for sociological reasons to the corroboration of the thought structure [Denkgebilde] [italics in GDSF].*

The restriction point is an idea that illustrates, in a clear fashion, the dominance of collective belief over experimental evidence. As has been pointed out before, the easy acceptance of a particular belief system allows new work to be readily described, readily assimilated and readily applauded by the collective group of scientists that share the core beliefs of the group. That the restriction point, based on experiments that should have had an alternative explanation, and which appears to be a concept that needs expulsion from the current view of the cell cycle, maintains such a hold on the field is a wonderful example of how the collective thought of the group prevents the alteration of the basic ideas of the group.

Lessons from Ludwik Fleck

As one can see, the ideas of Ludwik Fleck are not specific to some particular field. Rather, Fleck's ideas apply across the entire spectrum of thought processes where there is a group aspect to the intellectual process. As ideas become ingrained within the group they take on a life of their own. The origins of particular ideas are forgotten. Problems with the ideas are overlooked. New and uncomfortable ideas are not received easily by the group because of the quite wrenching effect it might have on the cohesive thought processes of the group.

If the only application of Fleck's ideas were to the area or phenomenon discussed here, the restriction point, then the ideas of Fleck would have a very narrow and limited application. But over the years I have heard many researchers bemoan the same problem that I have discussed here as related to a particular idea within their field. Thus one may suspect that Fleck's ideas have a wider application, and it is probable that others may take heart from the ideas presented here. If one feels that it is difficult to change or get rid of an entrenched idea, it may now be seen that there are reasons for this difficulty. It is just part of the human condition and human thought. It is not that one has not tried hard enough, or not worked hard enough, or not published enough. One must just acknowledge the conservative nature of thought structures. They do not change readily because if they did we would have chaos. But the result of stability is sometimes inertia and immobility.

And we must always be wary of stability that prevents new and even better ideas from displacing the current and comfortable ideas of the thought collective.

Closing thoughts

It is not the purpose of this discussion to prove that the widely accepted and widely used restriction point concept is wrong. That has been done in other papers. The purpose of this discussion is simply to show that Ludwik Fleck has codified various ideas as to why incorrect ideas persist and are maintained by the group or collective consciousness. It is hoped that these ideas are at a minimum interesting, and perhaps even helpful and inspiring.

Acknowledgements

Dr. Lawrence Sturman was instrumental in bringing me the work of Ludwik Fleck. Bernard Banet was helpful in understanding the life and thought of Ludwik Fleck. Comments may be sent to cooper@umich.edu. Related papers on the cell cycle may be viewed, and read, at www.umich.edu/~cooper .

REFERENCES




Figure 1. Ludwig Fleck, 1896-1961. Reprinted from <http://www.fmag.unict.it/polhome.html>




Figure 2. Synchronized divisions of three different mammalian cell lines and bacteria.

The absolute times for a each cell type varies, but the experimental results are normalized to generation time so that the synchrony curves overlap (from ⁽¹⁹⁾).

1. Cooper, S. in *Cell Growth* (ed. Nicolini, C.) 315-336 (Plenum Press, New York, 1981).
2. Cooper, S. A unifying model for the G1 period in prokaryotes and eukaryotes. *Nature* **280**, 17-19 (1979).
3. Helmstetter, C., Cooper, S., Pierucci, O. & Revelas, E. On the bacterial life sequence. *Cold Spring Harb Symp Quant Biol* **33**, 809-822 (1968).
4. Fleck, L. *Entstehung und Entwicklung einer wissenschaftlichen Tatsache: Einfuhrung in die Lehre vom Denkstil und Denkkollektiv* (Benno Schwabe & Co., Basel, Switzerland, 1935).
5. Fleck, L. *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1979).
6. Pardee, A. B. A restriction point for control of normal animal cell proliferation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **71**, 1286-1290 (1974).
7. Cooper, S. On G0 and cell cycle controls. *Bioessays* **7**, 220-223 (1987).

8. Cooper, S. Mammalian cells are not synchronized in G1-phase by starvation or inhibition: considerations of the fundamental concept of G1-phase synchronization. *Cell Prolif* **31**, 9-16 (1998).
9. Cooper, S. Reappraisal of serum starvation, the restriction point, G0, and G1-phase arrest points. *FASEB J* **17**, 333-340 (2003).
10. Cooper, S. Rethinking synchronization of mammalian cells for cell-cycle analysis. *Cell Mol Life Sci* **6**, 1099-1106 (2003).
11. Cooper, S. On the interpretation of the shortening of the G1-phase by overexpression of cyclins in mammalian cells. *Exp Cell Res* **238**, 110-115 (1998).
12. Cooper, S. A criterion for using chloramphenicol to define different processes in the initiation of DNA synthesis in bacteria. *J Theor Biol* **46**, 117-127 (1974).
13. Cooper, S. & Weusthoff, G. Comment on the use of chloramphenicol to study the initiation of deoxyribonucleic acid synthesis. *J Bacteriol* **106**, 709-711 (1971).
14. Allen, R. W. & Moskowitz, M. Arrest of cell growth in the G1 phase of the cell cycle by serine deprivation. *Exp Cell Res* **116**, 127-137 (1978).
15. Allen, R. W. & Moskowitz, M. Regulation of the rate of protein synthesis in BHK21 cells by exogenous serine. *Exp. Cell Res.* **116**, 139-152 (1978).
16. Chen, D. J.-C. & Wang, R. J. Cell division cycle in mammalian cells. VII. Mapping of G1 into six segments using temperature-sensitive cell cycle mutants. *Exp. Cell Res.* **155**, 549-556 (1984).
17. Wynford-Thomas, D., LaMontagne, A., Marin, G. & Prescott, D. Location of the isoleucine arrest point in CHO and 3T3 cells. *Exp Cell Res* **158**, 525-532 (1985).
18. Thornton, M., Eward, K. L. & Helmstetter, C. E. Production of minimally disturbed synchronous cultures of hematopoietic cells. *Biotechniques* **32**, 1098-1105 (2002).
19. Helmstetter, C. E., Thornton, M., Romero, A. & Eward, K. L. Synchrony in human, mouse, and bacterial cell cultures. *Cell Cycle* **2**, 42-45 (2003).
20. Cooper, S. Minimally disturbed, multi-cycle, and reproducible synchrony using a eukaryotic "baby machine" *Bioessays* **24**, 499-501 (2002).