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We've had the “It's the economy, stupid,”
election, the values voter election, the
national security election. We've watched
our national conversation pivot around issues that
land squarely on the kitchen table and challenge us
to weigh what matters most. But it’s easy to imagi-
ne that the twenty-first century conversation will
include one for which we are ill-prepared, and yet
somehow includes all the others: the challenge of
exploration, and how we draw the maps and pave
the roads into territory we have never traveled before.

The history of medicine is a story of values that
taper and swell as the challenges change. The
human body itself was a wilderness in the cen-
turies when piety precluded dissection, since it
involved desecration of God's image—and might
interfere with physical resurrection. Even when
autopsies became legal, they were limited to the
criminal and the poor—which was a bonanza for
grave robbers supplying the medical schools. Nor
are these antique qualms. Blood transfusions were
still controversial through World War II. The notion
of a heart transplant was horrifying to many peo-
ples: this was no mere pump, but the seat of the
soul. Even after Christiaan Barnard's successful
operation in 1967, Malcolm Muggeridge called the
surgery “the sort of thing the Nazis went in for,”
and the new president of the American College of
Cardiology likened it to “sending a man to the
moon without any hope of bringing him back, just
to beat the Russians,” reported the New York Times.

So something changes as time passes and the
radical becomes routine. The idea of a “test tube
baby” that alarmed so many people a generation
ago became the salvation to millions of once child-
less couples. But something else is changing as well
as our tools become more powerful, and that is the
speed with which we have to process our progress.
Each new breakthrough—the decoding of the
human genome, the promise of stem cell research,
the reengineering of agriculture, the challenge of
cloning—are all coming toward us more quickly
than our moral machinery can handle.

This was clear during the last midterm election,
when the question of funding for embryonic stem
cell research proved decisive in a number of con-
tests—with voters commonly relying on sound
bites for information. But reducing a complex sci-
centific and ethical debate to a 30-second spot all but
 guarantees misunderstanding. Any patient or fami-
ly faced with the ravages of Parkinson or
Alzheimer disease or paralysis would be forgiven
for believing that cures are just around the corner,
if only researchers were unleashed to do their work
with full federal funding and blessing. Hastings
Center president Tom Murray recalled for me the
time he appeared alongside Christopher Reeve to
testify before a Senate committee on stem cell
research. “Reeve said something to the effect that I
am confident that stem cell research is going to
cure me and allow me to get out of this chair,”
Murray recounted. “I was sitting at the table and I
was heartbroken. He looked terribly frail. And I
knew, and I was pretty sure that he knew, that if
cures were going to come, it was going to take
many years. And that his particular injury to the
spinal cord was probably not going to be one of the
first things they were going to be able to fix. So I
was heartbroken by the spectacle.”

Reeve's goal, like that of so many other patients
and their advocates, was to keep up the pressure
and insure that every avenue of research was being pursued. But this poses a challenge not just to patients and politicians and scientists, but to every citizen as well.

Scientists don’t like to tiptoe; they want to gallop. This is natural and is why regulations are useful in the first place—especially on the biotech frontier, where all kinds of morally complicated temptations lie. Balancing risks and rewards is a medical challenge; redefining what we mean by being human is a moral one. Figuring out where to draw the lines is, increasingly, a political one. And so a whole new kind of conversation is going to have to occur.

Many of the hard questions arise at intersections, not just between science and ethics but encompassing economics, politics, and faith. A national discussion about what should and should not be permissible when it comes to making babies or curing disease or growing food, requires a common language and honest brokers to guide the discussion and keep it fair and factual. This is where bioethicists play a fateful role—not just as conveners but as educators, laying out the terms of debate, culling the data, stripping the issue bare of superstition or ideology or agenda and inviting us all to walk around the challenges before us, to view them from all angles.

We are all about to go back to school; the lessons are likely to be hard and confusing. So we all owe a debt to the scholars and scientists and ethicists who have been quietly working through these issues for years and can help us find our way. From Birth to Death and Bench to Clinic: The Hastings Center Bioethics Briefing Book for Journalists, Policymakers, and Campaigns is an invaluable text for obtaining our new degree.