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CAPLAN: The thing about bioethics is how from the outside some issues are seen as bioethics and some not. The classic is abortion. Abortion is not a bioethics issue from the outside point of view. It may be an issue that bioethicists write about, it may appear in the Encyclopedia of Bioethics, it may appear in the collections and anthologies, and beginning with Dan Callahan and others, people have written books and collections about abortion. From the media point of view, from the legislative point of view abortion is a political issue, it is an issue that you call up for comments: feminists, right to life groups, maybe Planned Parenthood, maybe the Alan Gutmacher Institute, but I would bet you that if you look in abortion stories and coverage you’ll find almost no bioethicist commenting or saying anything. The culture has defined abortion as somehow so fundamental an issue that it’s beyond bioethics or it’s more than bioethics or, if you want to put it another way, it has grown so skeptical of the idea that it’s an ethics issue that it no longer talks to ethicists about it. So I don’t actually think you’re going to see much coverage of abortion.

FOX: Would you say the same is true of end-of-life?

CAPLAN: No, end-of-life is firmly in the bioethics camp according to how it’s seen from the
outside world. There are a few other issues that aren’t bioethics that could have been. The institutionalization of the mentally ill, isn’t that a bioethics issue? You’d think it could be, but for various reasons it is a psychiatric issue, it’s a homeless advocate issue, it’s a conservative politician “let’s just let them all go out there, they deserve to be there” issue. But it is almost never the case that anyone goes to anybody in bioethics and asks for comment on what is arguably the most important shift in mental health care in the past several decades.

FOX: Doesn't some of that have to do with what it is that the movers and shakers of bioethics have been willing to define as bioethics? If you look at the agenda it makes bioethics look extremely conservative from a political point of view in terms of all they have de-listed.

CAPLAN: If you listed five major structural institutional changes, the legalization of abortion is clearly a major one in the past thirty years. Bioethics has made a scholarly contribution to that, but it hasn’t made much of a policy dent. De-institutionalization of the mentally ill would have to be on that list for me, that’s a major shift. It would include the rise of managed care, we can argue about whether bioethics is doing anything or not, on that subject.

FOX: Just beginning to get into it, but on a very doctor-patient relationship basis, not institutional ethics.

CAPLAN: No organizational ethics, not much there. There's also the rise of the
corporatization of bio-medicine on the research side, the turning of medical research into a for-profit enterprise complete with patents and licensing. I think the Penn Bioethics Center is trying hard to get into that, but generally most people aren’t. That’s been a major shift in the past thirty years during bioethics’ coexistence. And then you could probably say another major structural change has been the expansion of the world of alternative medicine and of non-physician providers--the rise of the nurse, the rise of the psychologist, the rise of the social worker. Has bioethics had anything to do with this? I doubt it. So I think Paul Wolpe is the only person I know in bioethics who has anything to say about alternative or complimentary medicine whatsoever, period. If there’s another one, I haven’t met him yet. My point being that major shifts at the structural/organizational level are not reflected in bioethics at all, and that’s just interesting.

To me, there are two ways to look at this. There are days when I say bioethics, that’s just what we mean by social medicine, the history of medicine, it means everything and that’s all that bioethics means. So if you inflate it out then bioethics should do these things. If you just say that bioethics is the literal normative prescriptive element about what ought to be in health care, as done by theologians and philosophers traditionally, then it’s not up to the job. It’s not a critique to say those things.
I fault the medical educators for saying practically over the course of the whole century that we must do more about the non-biomedical aspects of education and we must do more about social medicine, etc. Each time they have seized upon a particular discipline, and now, they need to understand what they should and should not expect of bioethics that is narrowly framed. It’s not the fault of bioethics that medical educators think that it’s everything from anthropology to theology.

I’ll say this only because I think it’s relevant to the study. I think that so many attempts have been made to introduce the social context of medicine into medicine and failed, that the strategy now is to do the stealth bomber thing and attach them all to bioethics, call them bioethics and bring them in that way. That’s why I’ve always been resistant in some sense to the continuing attempt to resurrect social medicine. It’s sort of like, just smuggle the stupid thing in and take it!! Bioethics doesn’t care all that much...maybe I’m wrong but maybe it doesn’t. My only comment is, at this point, about some of social science, say of Charles Bosk trying to put social medicine in at Penn, or Arthur Kleinman wanting to get social medicine taken seriously at Harvard, the question also becomes, if the culture respects something called bioethics, whatever it is, and if the bioethicists can be told, who cares what we call it!! Call it Fred!! (laughter)

Look what’s happening this semester. I am giving the sociology of medicine and
the sociology of bioethics again. I am giving the sociology of bioethics again because I only took in 40 last semester and there are at least twice that many people waiting to take it. So I open it up again, there are 51 people who are registered, and there are still people calling me and asking to get in. My sociology of medicine course, which I consider to be more basic, has a thin 20 people in it. If I opened up this course in the sociology of bioethics and said there are no limits, we’d have 100 in a day. So I agree with you; I am getting all the pre-meds who are interested in anything other than biology taking something called bioethics. The irony of all this is, in its current form, if bioethics can be catholic with a little “c” and embrace the tools, we’re doing social, cultural, religious, historical, legal, which I think is what it should do, but is there is no place to fund bioethics that way because some of the old funding sources are divided by the older traditional divisions. Are you social science, or are you historical studies, or are you humanities, or are you whatever? So it’s a challenge from where I sit. I believe that the future of bioethics is to expand and absorb or collaborate, or however you want to put it, with these disciplines. What it’s called I know is of great interest to lots of people, but I don’t much care. I think bioethics has the marketing lead, it’s the thing that’s saleable. I think medical educators, incidently, have to do a little bit of homework and they have to understand what it is that they are using. They’ve never gotten psychiatry
straight, and they’ve never gotten sociology straight, and they’ve never gotten bioethics straight. (Laughter)

And to add in, they’ve never gotten demographics straight, they don’t have aging straight.

They have biomedical and non-biomedical and everything that is thrown into that second category is undifferentiated, interchangeable....

They’ve also tried to fit something else into the medical educators’ side, which is this wacky thing called professionalism, whatever that is.

And humanism.... This is supposed to turn you into a good person.

Right! And I say, go to the philosophy meetings, you’ll see very un-nice people who spend their whole lives doing ethics. They’re not nicer. I believe there can be some more reflection and so on if you study it, but it does not change your character to read Plato. That’s been going on for a long time.

At this point we would like to take you back to Hastings. We never got you from Columbia to Hastings last time. How did you get to Hastings?

I got to Hastings through one of the great unplanned events of my life...I sat next to Dan Callahan on an airplane. (Laughter) I was sent to a conference by Bernard Schoenbeng, on genetics, believe it or not. People were interested in genetics, genetic testing, cloning.

What year was this?
This was 1978. If you need exact dates you should check my CV. My head may be wrong, I could be off by a year here.

Bernard Schoenberg was sending you to a meeting on genetics?

Yes. There was a conference going on, run by one of the groups that was trying to battle XYY and the criminal chromosome and this sort of stuff. And he said, “Go up there and see what’s going on. I’ll let you pick a conference.” He knew I was interested in evolution and biology. He thought, okay, that may be an interesting thing. To be honest, I don’t remember if I went to him and said, “That looks interesting, could I go?” Anyway, I went up there. I don’t remember anything about the conference, I guess it was interesting.

Where was it held?

It was held in the Sonesta Hotel in Cambridge. There must’ve been like 20 people. I don’t even remember what the hell took place at that thing. I do remember Reed Pyeritz was there, who’s a geneticist who’s now moved on to Allegheny. And there were a few other notables. Jonathan King and Jonathan Beckwith were there. So it wound up being a little bit of “science for the people-ish.”

So just by chance you sat next to Dan Callahan?

Yes, on the way home. One of the speakers turned out to be Dan Callahan, who knew nothing about genetics. I still find him opining about it occasionally. I never say anything, but I wonder why he’s doing this because this is something he
really knows nothing about. Anyway, I sat next to him on the plane, just by
accident, I didn’t angle to sit there. I just wound up sitting next to him. He said,
“You were at that meeting, weren’t you?” I said, “Yes.” He said, “What do you
do?” I said, “Well, I’m at this Columbia program. I’m trying to invent courses
and do things.” He said, “Oh that sounds interesting. Did you ever hear of the
Hastings Center?” I said, “No.” (Laughter) He said, “It’s been around and you’re
interested in these things. What do you do?” I said, “I was a graduate student
taking a history and philosophy of science thing and did a masters degree in
biology and I’m trying to write my dissertation on evolution.” He said, “Oh that’s
very interesting, a lot of genetics issues. I don’t really know that much about
genetics.” He was lying, he knew nothing! (Laughter) And he said, “We’re
interested in people who have a science background and that sort of thing.
Sometimes we have jobs open up, research assistant jobs.” I said, “Boy, I’d really
like to get a job someday...a job would be good.” (Laughter) And he said, “Give
me a call, drop me a note.” So nothing happens and then summer comes and I
thought, maybe I’ll ask if they have any positions for the summer. I wrote and
they said, “Yes, we do. The person who is the “gopher”, xerox person, reference
person...” In fact it’s a long string of them. I wasn’t the first but I was an early
one of those. So I took that job and they liked what I was doing so I stayed
around. I was still finishing my dissertation. We’re up to 1979, I still didn’t
defend it until 1979.

What were you called?

Research assistant, or something like that. The Center had been awarded National Endowment for the Humanities Post-doctoral Program, where they could have three post-docs. This was really early days before the NEH decided it hated applied ethics and would never support it, which is what happened when Bill Bennett went there, as a matter of fact. But in these early days of Joe Duffey from the University of Massachusetts...By the way, side note: the NEH has never recovered from the Reagan era political decision to de-fund applied ethics as too politically controversial, which might be part of the social critique. It isn’t an accident in some ways that bioethics may have moved away from certain types of social analysis because it was getting beaten on by the Reagan era funders. Not that they ran cowardly, they couldn’t get support. So Bennett made the NEH into a kind of political arm of the Republican party and the right wing and also was only funding for a time, sort of repository-type work. You could get humanities stuff if you promised to store the works of Plato, or archive Boethius, but you weren’t going to get anything if you said you were going to do an ethics meeting on genetics. That was not acceptable. But the Hastings grant was pre-Reagan. I applied for a post-doc, and in one of the great unethical moments of my career, I won the post-doc before I had my doctorate. So somewhere in the middle of my
post-doc I did defend my dissertation and became a post of a doc. But there was a
little interlude there where Dan was looking at me pretty squirrely: Did you finish
this? When is your dissertation going to be defended and this sort of thing. So in
fact my whole career, now that I think of it in bioethics personally, has been
marked by fraud and deception. I started as a phony medical student and I wound
up being a post-doc when I wasn’t a doc and it’s not good.

FOX: So what did you do on your pre-doc/post-doc?
CAPLAN: I worked on ethical issues in genetics, as a matter of fact. They had a group that
was chaired by John Fletcher and Marc Lappé, Tabitha Powledge and Ruth
Macklin were all on that committee. Other outsiders who came...Bob Murray;
Alex Capron, who still was at Penn I believe at that time; and Jonathan Beckwith
was a member of that group. There was a guy named Park Davis, who is a
psychiatrist geneticist from McLean or Mass. General. I kind of wound up
working with that group and thinking about the ethics of genetic testing and
screening because those were the days when they were just coming off large scale
Tay-Sachs and sickle cell screening programs. I do laugh now when I hear people
say, “We’ve never thought about genetic testing and breast cancer testing on a
large scale,” which is just silly.

FOX: You’re talking about the late 1970’s.
Yes. This group actually produced a paper.

I wouldn’t associate all these people any longer with genetics.

No, but they were mobilized by it.

Alex had personal family reasons for being interested in this.

Yes, and Murray is a geneticist, and Tabitha was always fascinated by genetics.

Lappe was a pathologist by training, so he had some reason to be looking into genetics.

A very, very distinguished group. Alex was as young as you...

Alex, at the time, was like an assistant professor. I think Alex is older than me by maybe seven or eight years, something like that. He was youthful. That group produced a paper in the *New England Journal of Medicine*. It was a very important thing in the history of bioethics because it was one of the first group-authored position statements from a private place, not a government place, that was talked about and discussed that had influence within the medical community.

There were others, I don’t want to say there were none. The brain death discussions that Alex got into with Leon Kass were something like this. They were kind of a consensus by a group that was almost...I don’t know what else to call it, self-appointed. The Hastings genetics group, compared to a group like the Harvard ad hoc committee on the definition of death, was a group of ethicists meeting to say, “We declare...from the Hastings Center, here is something to pay
attention to,” getting it published in the New England Journal and then having anybody care.

FOX: Do you know what date that was?
CAPLAN: I want to say 1979, I can find it.

FOX: Who was the editor of the New England Journal of Medicine?
CAPLAN: At that time... Inglefinger.

FOX: Did Inglefinger facilitate this?
CAPLAN: Yes, I think he was more interested and sympathetic than previous editors had been...yes.

FOX: But he wasn’t the person who published Henry Beecher’s article.

CAPLAN: No, I don’t know who the editor was at that time, that pre-dated me. I do know that this was a cause of some excitement and a lot of celebration, that was a paper that was pivotal for the Hastings Center. It was a legitimator. It said, “We’ve had this group meet out in the woods, at this Hastings Center”, which no one had ever heard much about in mainstream medicine and, “Here is a substantial set of recommendations about how to deal with testing and screening for genetic diseases.” And it got a lot of letters back that said these are good or helpful or even saying, “I’m not sure this is right, maybe you ought to think about this,” but it was treated as a very substantial thing and I think....

FOX: Did you deliberately not engage people who were connected with Kennedy?
CAPLAN: I can’t answer that one either. I don’t know.

FOX: The reason I ask that is because I was on the original board of directors of Hastings even though sociologists were defined as people who were totally ineligible to be in bioethics. And one of the early issues on that board was that a good deal of Dan’s work was coming from stuff that Kennedy was asking Hastings to do. I remember that we, the board, suggested that he’d better be vigilant and not end up being a sort of handmaiden of the Kennedy. Not because of the competitiveness with another Center, but because they had a quasi-political agenda. So it’s sort of interesting that I assume none of these people were particularly associated with the genetics group. It did put Hastings on the map in a certain kind of way. Actually, the Kennedy Institute was on the map because of the Washington bounty, so to speak, that went along with it.

CAPLAN: I can say this...that when I wound up getting this post-doc, I had to make a choice about something, which is of minor interest, but it relates to the Kennedy Institute. I do get my doc and I have to think about what am I going to do. I had a conversation with Sidney Morganbesser who said, “It would not be wise to throw your career away in a cesspool of despair like bioethics, whatever the hell that is. You are smart enough to be a real philosopher of science and you should do that. It is a disgrace that you are doing anything else. I don’t know what this Hastings Center is, and I don’t know what that bioethics stuff is but, don’t do it.” I also
decided at that time, further irritating my mentors, to edit a collection which was The Sociobiology Debate; my first edited book. The first thing I ever did. I have to tell you, it has been the thing that I did that sold the most copies, it’s still in print, it still sells copies. It sold more than a thousand copies last year, that is sixteen years out...twenty years after I did it! So I was doing this as a graduate student. Ernst Nagle and Sidney Morganbesser said to me, “You do not take time off from your dissertation to edit a collection. Who are you to edit a collection?” I said, “This is nuts! My dissertation is partly about sociobiology.” I was interested enough in the ethics, but there is also the question of, could you find ways to test evolution? In sociobiology the evolution of insects that don’t reproduce into sterile casts is one hell of a test of evolution because it’s inexplicable. It shouldn’t happen. So how do you explain that? It’s a major problem. Darwin knew it too. He had a whole discussion in The Origin about how could there be sterile insects that have highly adaptive traits in a theory that says you change through gradual descent by heredity over time? They had no idea what to do with this 

I remember going to the AAA meeting in Philadelphia, I think. The lineup of speakers for the session on sociobiology was: E.O.Wilson, Steven J. Gould, Richard Alexander, he is a very famous evolutionist from the University of Michigan, William Irons, a famous physical anthropologist, and Arthur Caplan.
There is this line up of huge biological heavyweights and some noodnick graduate student! (Laughter)

You're not even really a post-doc and you're in this group! Was there something about this bioethics configuration that made this possible? In the field of philosophy this wouldn't have been possible.

Impossible...beyond impossible!

You didn't have to be venerable obviously, did you?

You could wedge your way sociologically into the group, although I wasn’t completely eased in. I mean, people were sort of...you’re the junior guy. People like Alex could also be pretty alert to the idea that you show me you belong here, as opposed to the fact that you’re just sitting here. Someone like Alex, at that time, is saying, “I’m making my career here and I don’t want to just think that anybody can come in and sit at the table and start to spout profundity.” He wanted to be shown that I belonged there.

Did he? So you consider him older than you?

Oh yea! Leon Kass and Alex for me were a little bit of mentoring or people that I thought about emulating. They’re not old enough to be of the next generation but they were older enough to be like older brothers, or something like that, not peers.

I don’t think of them as my peer group. I think of myself as the start of a different peer group. For me, generationally speaking, Dan to Alex represents a kind of
generation.

Jay Katz to Alex does too.

Jay Katz to Alex; André Hellegers to Alex, that group. They might differentiate themselves but, they might have said there was an older group that included Joe Fletcher, and maybe Jay Katz, and maybe Otto Guttentag, and some of these other real older guys. But to me, I don’t think that’s right even thinking about it, not from the point of view of youth but just from the point of view of sociology. I think that cadre hung together, sort of doing the same kind of stuff. They were under the influence of those early religious thinkers. Ramsey was a figure to contend with, and Gustafson.

I just discovered by going over the Hastings Center Report issue on Henry Beecher that he was a teacher of Jay Katz in medical school, and when Beecher was writing that article about clinical research, he kept coming up to Yale to agonize with Jay Katz because he was worried about what was going to happen. I already knew that because Jay Katz told me.

Where does Leon Kass fit in there?

He’s in that same cohort. Those guys are the junior members but they, I think, are in the same bonding experience in the founding of the field, of early orientation toward religion, it’s not so disciplinary. It is even for those people. If I’d asked Alex in 1978 or 1979, “Alex are you a bioethicist?” he would’ve looked at me
like I was nuts. He would have said I’m an attorney, or lawyer, or law professor with an interest in ethical issues in health care or policy. He wouldn’t have said, “I’m a bioethicist.” I’m the start of the generation that says you’re a bioethicist. That’s the difference. Everybody before that is saying I’m a person who’s a sociologist. You are! If I went to you in 1978 and said, “Are you a bioethicist?” You would have said, “I don’t know what it is and no, I’m not! Whatever it is, I’m not that.”

FOX: That’s true.

CAPLAN: But after about the time that I appeared in the late seventies, a 1978, ‘79, ‘80 cutoff, bioethics becomes something. It’s starting to disciplinize or whatever you call these things.

FOX: You know none of the people you’re talking about are philosophers...well, Dan is.

CAPLAN: Dan is and Veatch arguably is a sort of theologian-philosopher type.

FOX: So he is pre- “I am a bioethicist.”

CAPLAN: Yes. Ruth Macklin is. Ruth would’ve said, “I’m a philosopher.” Sam Gorovitz would’ve said, “I’m a philosopher.” He’s in that group.

FOX: So you’re really saying it’s not only a matter of age but also a some kind of breakthrough...

CAPLAN: Some kind of experience...something’s going on that’s causative.

FOX: What were you saying by saying you were a bioethicist when compared to these
other people? What did you mean by that as compared with saying, “I’m a
philosopher who is interested in...?”

CAPLAN: You would’ve said, “I may not take a job in a philosophy department, I might take
a job in...”

END OF TAPE ONE, SIDE ONE

FOX: Was there some very strong conviction that guided your whole career, that you
had some determination to put these issues in the public domain?

CAPLAN: No, not at that time, not for me. I had smidgens of it because sociobiology had
become a public controversy but I wouldn’t have thought I should talk about this
to the newspaper. I noted the fact that it was of public interest, I kind of thought
about, what should I do if a reporter asks me a question...none ever did. I was
worried about what’s E.O. Wilson going to think, and what’s Steven J. Gould
going to think, and what are these thousand other scientists that are assembled
here going to think? That was what worried me. I was just terrified that the
reporters might ask me something. I had no public intellectual thoughts. For me,
right at this transition time, I thought, did I make the right move? I turned down
some job offers, Dennison College philosophy department and Wellesley College
philosophy department had offered me jobs. I got a job offer from the University
of Colorado, and a couple of others. They were all philosophy of science jobs.

My department at Columbia was going nuts! First, I’m not taking these jobs, I’m
going to do this post-doc when I’m not a doc, and then I’m writing this anthology running around with E.O. Wilson somewhere. This was not a happy time. So I was getting extreme pressure to get back on track and go down the disciplinary chute of philosophy as it was then understood. Why didn’t I? I thought two things. One, I thought I can do both. That’s really what I thought...I don’t know if that’s true, but I thought I could. I thought, I’ll just pursue both. Two, I thought I should try the bioethics thing and see how it feels. I’m not sure I’d be happy just in a philosophy department, especially as I had visited Dennison, no derogation of Dennison, but it was a small department with just four or five people, I thought, “Gee, is that it? Hastings has people coming through from different fields, they’re sort of interesting, I don’t know, I’m not so sure that...”

This was a tough job market, and the department was also furious that I was kicking out these jobs; I’ve got these five or six job offers, they can’t place students and I’m pissing these away to go to something they’ve never heard of, the Hastings Center. So this is very bad. I will say this, Ernst Nagle later reconciled himself to the fact that this was okay and I could do it. Sidney never did. Morganbesser always thought, until the day he died, that was a waste of a philosophical career. The fact that I became a public intellectual later somewhat made that okay for him because he admired that even though he never did it. But the fact that I was doing it in this nutty bioethics thing was not too good. So it
was a matter of personal thinking.

What did people think of Bertrand Russell when he became a public intellectual?

Do you think he was finished with philosophy?

Yes, he’d moved on to something else. You could be a public intellectual...to some extent, John Searle or Bernard Williams, there were others. They weren’t as public a person as Bertrand Russell who would opine about matters of the day, but it was always clear they were doing it as philosophers, not as activists or picketers or something like that. So it wasn’t that you could never say anything outside the conference room or high table or something, but it was sort of in your role that said retreat. Morganbesser, however, came from the New York culture and understood public intellectuals in a very different way, so he wouldn’t have had the British model. The British model, outside of Bertrand Russell, who was loony, is more the Oxford that you know, where you might certainly tell the lower classes what they ought to be up to. You could certainly explain to them how to behave and then return to your work.

So what were the repercussions of this precocious thing that happened to you in terms of this genetics report that became a landmark in the evolution of bioethics, the legitimation of the Center, and you’re finally a post-doc?

I can make a tighter synopsis of this because this is a transition that is interesting. A couple of things happened. I was reflective about what bioethics was and some
of the things you are asking me because I was so much consumed by this personal
issue of what was I doing? You think it’s just an accident that I have this sort of
thoughtfulness about it, but it isn’t. I don’t mean thoughtful like intelligent, I just
mean that I’ve thought about it. I thought about because I was trying to figure out
what the hell am I doing here?! I had to think about it a lot. Today, Glenn McGee
thinks about it very differently. He’s in a different generation from me. He’s the
entry point to the established world of bioethics. He just wants to be good at it, or
heard, or visible, but it’s a different game. I was there at the point where it was
transitioning into an entity. People like Dan Callahan and Jay Katz and Alex
Capron and Leon Kass were there at the conception and embryonic development.
I was there when it got baptized and started to have a childhood. Glenn is arriving
in adolescence or young adulthood. That’s how I really see it. And his cohort,
Peter Ubell and everybody in this Center, Paul, Pamela, Mildred, they’re in that
group. They’re not my cohort, they’re different.

FOX: Who would you include in your cohort?

CAPLAN: Oh, it might be Marty Benjamin as a philosopher, Stuart Youngner, Alan
Weisbard is my cohort, Alan Brandt is my cohort. Dan Wikler....There’s more, let
me think here a second....

FOX: Did all these people know they were bioethicists when they entered?

CAPLAN: Yes. They were at least wrestling with the same questions. Dan Wikler
absolutely was. He probably didn’t know then but he had to make a decision within four or five years about whether he was. So maybe not at that time but shortly thereafter he would be confronted with that question. Yes, I’ll say that. There is a whole host of these people trying to wrestle with the question of, “Am I one of these or am I not?” I’ll tell you another person, Tom Beauchamp, who is actually older than me, but nonetheless was coming into bioethics as an area of interest and trying to figure out, “Am I going to do this?” Ruth Faden, too. So again, it’s not an age thing.

FOX: No, that’s quite clear.

CAPLAN: Tris Englehardt is in this group. I’ll tell you a cohort member that will make you laugh, Charles Bosk. Charles may never have identified himself as a bioethicist until 1996 but he’s in the cohort trying to decide, What’s he doing with Forgive and Remember, what’s he doing with his genetics studies?

FOX: He’s thought a great deal about all sorts of things.

CAPLAN: But he’s in that cohort. So is Larry McCullough from Baylor.

FOX: Some of these people, though, who were making decisions, already had careers in a particular discipline. Charles Bosk had to decide how he was going to define himself but not what job was he going to get.

CAPLAN: Bonnie Steinbach and Loretta Kopelman are also in the same group. They are philosophers moving toward some attempt. George Agich. I’m looking over at
that *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* because if I opened it up and looked through the contributors list I could do it.

FOX: There is still another person who got “bioethicist” pinned to them rather than having chosen it.

CAPLAN: I tried to pin it on you for many years. (Laughter)

FOX: The interesting thing is it’s another pattern of institutionalizations, the way in which if you continue to do a certain kind of work with certain themes in it and also have a certain relationship to the circle of people who are officially bioethicists and so forth, the mantle descends upon you, or something like that.

CAPLAN: It does, in one sense. You may say, “Look, I’m not that. I’m still a sociologist through and through.” In informal talk and in making lists of who’s in and who’s out, the mantle is always tossed around that way. If we ever said, “Well, who are the social scientists that do bioethics?” Your name would be there. In the informal way that that goes...oh yea, there’s Bernard Barber and there’s you.

FOX: What do they do in sociology that makes them eligible to be called bioethicists?

CAPLAN: Not only certain topics but certain ways of looking at those topics?

FOX: What do they do in sociology that makes them eligible to be called bioethicists?

CAPLAN: Yes, exactly. I think that genetics thing at Hastings gave me a big boost, it legitimated me. I wrote a paper in a completely obscure book about the history of eugenics and thinking about the rise of genetic testing. The group liked it. It was published in the collection of papers that Tammy Powledge and Marc Lappé
edited, which I probably still have somewhere, by a publisher that was maybe a half-step above a Vanity Press. But the group said, “This guy knows something about the science and he’s got some grasp on the history.” And then I just sort of gained entry to other groups right then and there. I was not, however, gaining entry as an equal, I was gaining entry as a person who could come and listen and could ask a question maybe, but not as a full peer. I remember what we talked about was the Hastings Center group like the Foundations of Ethics group that ran for a while; McIntyre, Ramsey, Eric Cassell, Steven Toulmin was in that. Goldman, who’s now at Duke, the philosopher Marty Goldman. Some real serious intellectual thinkers.

FOX: Did these groups grow under the auspices of the Hastings?

CAPLAN: Every year they tried to have a meeting on the foundations of ethics and it produced four volumes, which were published by the Hastings Center, unfortunately, because they didn’t get a real university press to do it and so the distribution got limited. But the meetings were very good and I met a lot of people there. I was easily the youngest person by far in those crowds, but I want to say again, not as an equal but I got an entry. The door opened up and I could get invited to the weekend seminar and Dan began thinking of me as somebody more than somebody to order the xeroxing from.

FOX: So there was much more hierarchy in this group....
CAPLAN: Oh yea, it was hierarchical and you still had to prove your metal and sort of be respectful of your elders. I think it was like going into a group of World War II veterans in one sense. These were the people who fought the fight to make the field. And here were you as somebody who would reap the benefits of their battles.

And I have that feeling now when I look at Glenn, I think, “Gosh, I fought all these fights to get the media to pay attention, and now they just call you up directly and that’s it, you talk to them.” What the hell’s that all about!! Yea, something like that. They were the intellectual victors in the fight to get the thing going.

FOX: The earliest phase of the Hastings Center, actually the day that it was founded, I was physically there. The people who were among the founding fathers and who would have been the original gatekeepers included people, peculiarly enough, like Michael Novak and people you would associate not at all with this field or with philosophy.

CAPLAN: Worse, Michael Novac became part of the Reagan revolution and was probably at the foot of Bill Bennett when they decided to fight applied ethics. A story that I don’t know anything about but that’s where he was.

FOX: I suppose this has something to do with Dan’s Commonweal circle, and also his circle from Harvard and the philosophy department.
It did. Because one of the interesting things, there was a gatekeeping thing vis-à-vis somebody like myself. I think it was Michael Novak who told me that I wasn’t really a sociologist and one of the reasons I wasn’t, and this was a compliment, was because I wrote so well. This was a humanist kind of thing. So it’s interesting to go back because what I sense here is not only a hierarchy but a very elaborate quasi-formal number of gatekeepers. This is very interesting because this isn’t organized in the usual fixed institutional way. It’s quite a fluid situation.

It’s a really wacky situation. And yet you obviously did a long apprenticeship. Did an apprenticeship, and it’s a fluid and wacky situation in a sense in which the gatekeepers are not necessarily at the institution. They’re coming there for meetings, they’re coming there for intellectual things, they’re writing for the journal, they’re on the phone, but they’re not gatekeeping at the Hastings Center. They are gatekeeping back at their individual forums, to take this metaphor somewhere. I can tell you one other point of tension, when you asked about Kennedy-Hastings relations. Al Jonsen, who is certainly in this founding group and a pivotal figure, was not particularly welcome at Hastings at the time I got there because he clearly had ties to Kennedy, and it was a source of tension. And I think Al, at Hastings, wasn’t as trusted by Dan and Will because if you look
you’ll see he’s not there as much.

That’s not where I met him...never.

I think it was the Georgetown tie, maybe even the Jesuit connection or something.

Try this on for Al too, another challenge. Al was on the West Coast, bioethics is in the East. There was always a threat that Al would do something in the West that would pull attention and support away from those eastern institutions. So he represented a funny threat that never happened. Just as an American culture phenomena, how did bioethics start in the East? Nothing starts in the East, it starts in the West, it comes from California...that’s at least the myth. This thing is completely eastern.

It’s true; Al’s origins are different from anybody else’s because he grew up in San Francisco.

He’s almost like the wrong culture somehow. He’s coming from the wrong part of the country, he’s out there. I think there was even a fear that if Al set up a West Coast Hastings Center, it might actually be damaging to the ability of Hastings to survive. So there may have been a certain fear and even isolation of him, and he was a guy who was quite capable of being political and thinking, “I will set this up, I don’t need you, I’ll run my own thing out here.” Even arguably, he should’ve. I mean it’s certainly the case that the United States is big enough and populous enough, we could’ve had a West Coast thing. It’s always been a source
of some frustration that if you go to Berkley and Stanford and UCSF, there’s
nothing there.

FOX: It’s kind of like the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, it has a West Coast
branch but it never really got out of Boston.

CAPLAN: Yes, and bioethics looks that way, it still tips to the East and the Midwest, the
Western presence is still weak. Anyway....

FOX: Okay, by this time are you still a research assistant or a research associate?

CAPLAN: I’m a research associate. And then I became associate for the humanities, maybe
two years after that, which was still pretty unprecedented, to be a real faculty, full-
fledged member. By the way, at this time at Hastings, I’ve got a really interesting
intellectual group to play with because I still have Marc Lappe, I still have Tammy
Powledge, I still have Ruth Macklin, I still have Bob Veatch, I still have Dan, I
still have Will. Peter Steinfels and Margaret Steinfels are both there, who were
fun to talk to. Carol Levine had just arrived, who was fun to talk with. And in the
post-doc ranks, remember they still had the post-doc program: Tom Murray, Ron
Baird, John Arras. John is now at Virginia, took over John Fletcher’s job.

Jonathan Moreno. Nancy Roden, who killed herself...suicide, but was a very good
law professor, went on to take a job at the University of North Carolina Law
School, was excellent. She wrote very important papers on the Baby Doe
controversy. She was really good, smart. Larry McCulough, who’s now at Baylor
does bioethics, he is also smart.

What happens to me at Hastings is I move onto a track and begin to establish some areas of expertise. They are built upon the things that I studied when I was wandering around the Columbia medical school. Reproductive technology, which I mentioned I had seen early snafus and debates about. Dialysis and transplant, though I never was actually a student of transplant in the way that you spend time observing and so on. But I was a student of dialysis. And later, in fact, when I went to Minnesota, I went back in and studied transplants observationally, but at this point my expertise about transplant and dialysis was all on the dialysis side. I looked at it, I knew about the technology. I can tell you something that is amusing, I distinctly remember in about 1985, reading a book called _Courage to Fail_, which I hadn’t read or knew about until then. I actually read another one then called _Experiment Perils_, but that’s when I found out about you, that was about 1984.

FOX: We saw you on television once with a copy of _Courage to Fail_ behind your head before I actually knew you.

CAPLAN: Really? (Laughter) Actually that’s when I remember reading those books. I was starting to say, “We should do a project on transplants, Dan. It’s a very interesting area, there are issues about how to get organs....” Now, Hastings had done some work, you’ll recall this, with the Sadlers. The Uniform Anatomical Gift Act and
so forth. They didn’t do it but they were one place among many where those
discussions took place.

FOX: When did Paul Ramsey do his whole thing “the patient as person”?


FOX: So that ante-dates this but Hastings hadn’t picked it up.

CAPLAN: No. Ramsey is still, however, physically there and talking about it at many
meetings. He is a major intellectual force at the Hastings Center, it should never
be forgotten how important that guy was. He’s actually an intellectual force on
me too. Whatever conservative streaks I have and attitudes toward technologisms
is probably due to Ramsey and listening to him. I didn’t personally like him, but I
thought he was onto interesting issues.

FOX: Years...years before other people. In terms of genetics too, he saw things years
before anybody else did.

CAPLAN: I think that’s right, even in vitro fertilization and other things.

FOX: Just to go back a minute, what is Bernie Schoenberg thinking about this road you
went down?

CAPLAN: Ah, about this time, 1984-ish, I have to make a choice. I’m still trying to work
those courses at Columbia. I’m now bringing Hastings Center “insights” back to
Columbia, and it’s okay.

FOX: People were more interested in your courses then?
CAPLAN: Yes. (Laughter) They liked them better. I’d actually built up a little group at Columbia. Alan Brandt, Vanessa Merton, Betty Levin, Anne Dill, who’s an anthropologist at Brown now and still does bioethics-type anthropology. Betty Levin still does sociology. She’s done a lot of the studies on newborn and neonatal care, what attitudes are about allowing babies to die, that kind of stuff.

FOX: You formed this group?

CAPLAN: Me! (Laughter) There was a guy named Lon Pamber who was a theologian. Kim Hopper who went on to become a homeless person advocate, was very political. Kim was actually an interesting figure because some of the things that would occasionally irritate you about the way bioethics goes, Kim was irritated by it too. He wanted us to not only talk about something but actually go out and do something about homeless people. He was saying, “Look this system stinks so why don’t we ever criticize it? We’re just in here band-aiding this stuff all the time....” I had some of those impulses too but he had them to the point where he literally left academia and went on to have a social activist career. To me, I always thought I was too selfish, I like doing intellectual stuff and I think it takes a certain amount of egomania to be an academic. You like to listen to yourself, you like to have other people listen to you. Social activism is a different game. So that group was all at Columbia, and they were doing things like, we had begun to follow Sal, this rehab case that I have talked to you about where I follow this guy
intensively, unethically, intruded into his family, met his parents. We videotaped
him and showed identifiable videotapes of his case to medical students, without
flinching, without thinking, without blinking, just be yourself. We made the tapes
and look how terrible it is, and look how the nurses treat him and the physical
therapists treat him and so on. Some of that did become some writing of mine
that turned up in the Hastings Center Report, those articles you may have seen
about the ethics of chronic care, the ethics of rehab, were built on the Sal studies.
We had followed Sal for years, this may have been the only bioethics case study
that actually went intensively for seven years. There was another case named
Ellen, who was a young girl, a baby who had been born with spina bifida. The
neonatologist said, “Let her die.” The parents said, “No way!” We followed her
and she is now twenty-something years old. I haven’t stayed in touch with her but
Betty Levin told me...she was the case of the false prediction or what to do under
uncertainty. She turned out fine! She’s happy, she’s an accountant. Everything
the doctors predicted didn’t happen. She was the classic right-to-life poster child.
And she was always my humility lesson...remember Ellen. So we were following
cases like that and it was taking a lot more time because you had to go do these
video tapes. I had to do something. I had to decide, am I going to Hastings...?
We were doing field work...we had no idea what we were doing, we were doing
bad field work as a matter of fact, not bad but non-systematic. It was probably
fine. We were doing wonderful field work by the likes of Hastings Center because the Hastings Center couldn’t have fallen over a fact if it bit them! And we knew, Vanessa, Alan, myself, Kim, and others that this stuff was hot material. We were seeing real bioethics day-to-day, when Sal’s parents said, “Crawl across the floor to the bathroom because you have to learn to toilet yourself because we’re not going to do it for you anymore.” That was ethics. Do we say, “Why is he crawling around trying to get to the bathroom if he is decerebrate and paralyzed??” Or do we say, “This is interesting, we’ll just film it.” It was like... WOW! I picked Hastings and I picked it because the Columbia thing wasn’t going to go anywhere. We were going to stay on the periphery, we were doing exciting things but they weren’t....

FOX: The same problem that we were talking about at the beginning of our conversation, they’re never going to get into the medical education of ethics.

CAPLAN: No, absolutely not. Plus...you’ll appreciate this talking about hierarchical, I’ll tell you what wasn’t going to get into medical education: a twenty-nine to thirty-one year-old person telling the doctors anything about their ethics. That wasn’t going to be happening any time at all. I can do it now. I’ll never dye my hair. If I’m sitting around with attendings I want to look older than them if I can. But with philosophers, age is venerable, age is wisdom. You try to go in there with attendings and you’re like twenty nine years-old and they are like, what are you
crazy? I don’t care what you think!! So it’s not just the subject, it’s who’s peddling it. We’ve got this kiddy corp, this is a group of people in their late twenties, they’re graduate students and maybe some of them have PhDs.

FOX: Bernie Schoenberg didn’t have enough power.

CAPLAN: No, and then Bernie got cancer and that was the end of that.

FOX: Did he approve, though, of where you were going?

CAPLAN: No, he tried to fight it but when he got sick that ended it. Then I said, “I’m going to Hastings, I don’t even have my mentor here. I don’t have anybody to cover for me. I’m not powerful enough.” What was the legacy of Columbia? David Rothman. The dean created a position, the Bernard Schoenberg Chair, and gave it to Rothman. Isn’t that something? The Schoenberg Chair was the legacy of all that stuff we were doing. As you know, David didn’t pick up on any of it. And so a lot of that early field work, archival work, which could’ve been a kind of a primitive, qualitative sociology within bioethics died right there...just died. It carried forward in the work of people in the group. Alan became a social historian who writes about cigarette smoking. He does the kind of social history he does because he had that experience, which was formative for him.

: I’ll say this on the record, I felt disappointment that I didn’t get the Bernie Schoenberg Chair, but I was in no way old enough, I was in no way qualified.

But I still felt it was the wrong thing.
Even you might not get a chair in a medical school at this point because it’s not come that far yet. When you’re old maybe, but I don’t think the institutionalization of what you represent has gone that far yet.

Not that far. So that was the subject of bitterness, silly bitterness, but I still felt like it’s not the spirit of the thing, it isn’t what we’re supposed to be doing here. From my point of view, just an autobiographical view then, it’s not an accident that I have a lot of empathy to the social sciences. I start off thinking about ethics from the point of view of someone who is trying to position it relative to the science and medicine of it, to put it in context. That’s how all my philosophy was done. And then my Columbia experience that gets me interested is literally being a participant-observer. And then I spent the rest of the time there doing field work. So I didn’t know what I was doing but we were doing it, we didn’t read about it. So out of all that is how I come to be more sympathetic, I suspect, than most about the contextual side. I’ve seen the value of it. I believe that when you go to somebody’s house, as I said, and see a child crawl across the floor, where the parent takes the kid home and says, “We will care for you and build special toys,” and devotes their life to the care of their child or the handicapped, you then say, “Well, I can’t just take it at face value, the doctor says the ethics problem is this.” But if you then follow them out, it turns out that the ethics problem is ten other things. So I’ve always been wary. It’s not that the doctor is wrong but I’ve
always been wary that you can do ethics by just getting the story at the bedside
from the provider. I don’t believe it.

FOX: I see you’re going to have this new conference on the family.

CAPLAN: Right! And that orientation keeps showing there. We did the first meeting ever
where we had subjects talk at a research meeting. I think I did the first meeting
ever where we had any families come in and talk in a bioethics meeting, and now
we’re going to do the first meeting where mostly families are going to talk at a
bioethics meeting. So yes, it does come from that. Some people say, “Well, he
had polio so he’s got a sensitivity to the conversation.” No, no it’s not just that.
It’s watching to say, “Boy, you put this work in and get pulled in a certain
direction. Track the patients around. Go off-site, see what happens when they go
home.” That makes a difference.

FOX: I would argue the point that apart from the perceptiveness of Bernie Schoenberg,
that this was part of certain circles of psychoanalysts at that time. You didn’t get
things like the Mental Hospital by Stanton and Schwartz if the psychiatrists
weren’t interested in these issues. There’s a generational thing here too, because
most people think about psychoanalysts as being so fixated on individual
personality factors that there is a dichotomy here between the individual and the
social. That wasn’t in this era.

CAPLAN: From my point of view, Bernie was basically a teacher or another kind of a
mentor. He never said to me, “You better chase these patients home or you better
do this.” He was always very supportive of the idea. If I came in and said, “Well, we thought that what we should do is maybe stick with Sal and look in on him after his surgery, and this bad accident, and how he’s doing with his mother, every three months.” He would say, “Yea, I think that is important.” It wasn’t like he said, “You’d better get your butt off the chair....” No, I can’t say he ever did that, but he was always open to the idea that sustained looking over time would give you a reward. He was certainly sympathetic to that. I didn’t have to twist his arm about saying I wanted to stick with a patient for a long time and look.

FOX: So did all these factors converge then to make you commit yourself not only to bioethics, but to the part of your career at the Hastings Center in a way that was more firm, so to speak?

CAPLAN: Yes. What’s starting to happen is I’m starting to write articles, there’s a big burst of Arthur Caplan article-type stuff starting to appear in different places in the period we’re talking about now, in the 1980's. And I’m thinking, I’m pretty good at this, I can do this stuff. I like writing about it. I’m getting involved in things like the required request legislation. I’m starting to get involved in testimony on topics about end-of-life care. I’m starting to see a new world open up which is the possibility of using bioethics to change or reform policy. It’s happening kind of by accident, but to be fair, it’s happening because Hastings is growing and getting visible, and politicians might call up and say, “Do you have anyone who could help us about organ donation?” And Dan would say, “Art could.” And I would
just say, "Okay, what's the problem?" Ron Bayer was doing much the same thing, by the way, on HIV and AIDS issues and so was Carol Levine. They were getting involved very early with testing, and privacy, and compulsory testing. They were doing exactly what I was doing on the AIDS end of the street.

FOX: When was it that bioethics was getting into the polity?

CAPLAN: The 1980's.

FOX: Wasn't there a spurt before that? I mean the human experimentation stuff?

CAPLAN: Put it this way, I think there were early and important intersections with policy. Certainly the scandals Beecher, Belmont, IRB regs...1960's to early 1970's. That's a whole sequence and it opens the idea that legitimated bioethics. When I talked about the early warriors, they were fighting that fight. Alex is involved in that as much as Jay Katz. In that era, from say 1968 to 1972, just to date where I am relative to where Alex is, I'm still at college. So I don't even know about any of this.

FOX: That's interesting because at that early stage people like Kennedy and Mondale and Rogers were involved.

CAPLAN: I would say this is the legitimation of, "there is something here that we ought to pay attention to, ethical issues in health care or something." Brain death is that, brain death is emerging at this time, it's a policy thing. Alex and Leon and Bob Morrison and others are saying, "Maybe you want to define death by the total and irreversible...", and other committees are meeting. But to me, those are the
legitimation of ethics in health care, if you want to call it that, or that the subject is legitimate and there are things that could happen. By the time I’m doing it in the 1980’s, it’s “we come to bioethics for expertise as bioethics. Could you help us?” There isn’t any bioethics to go to post-Tuskegee, there’s just lawyers who were outraged, or philosophers who want to say something.

FOX: Do you think there is more activity going on in terms of putting some of this stuff into the legislature and the courts?

CAPLAN: In the 1980’s it’s a different style, it’s a request to sort of shape legislation or think about particular policy issues. It’s initiated often by the policy maker. I mean, trust me, no one came from the government and said, “Please help us with Tuskegee?” They were forced to, so to speak.

FOX: I still would like to know the whole story about how suddenly they discovered after thirty some odd years that Tuskegee was going on.

CAPLAN: And look at it this way, here’s a mystery of a different sort, how did they not discover that they had done all those radiation experiments for yet another thirty years, and no one came and asked for help about that either. That’s a good contrast. When Tuskegee breaks, Beauchamp writes, “There’s Willowbrook, there’s the Texas contraceptive trial, there’s the Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital experiments with the live cancer cells being injected, and the Brownsville double blind placebo control trial,” another great one. No Hawthorne effect, the ladies got pregnant, it wasn’t psychology. So people don’t come to anything called
bioethics and ask for help, they go to people who are health lawyers, or Paul
Ramsey who has said, “We will think about the patient as person.” I said, “Well,
what should we do?” By the time the radiation experiments are revealed in the
1990's people go immediately to a bioethicist and say, “You will chair the
commission. Bioethics will respond. We know that this is a bioethics problem.”
That's a transition from one kind of policy to another. When I'm getting into it in
the 1980's, it's part of the transition. I think I was the first bioethicist to ever
testify in court, and the first bioethicist to ever testify in the legislature, how's that
for claims? Maybe I'm wrong but I think....

FOX: What did you testify about?
CAPLAN: I think I testified first in the New York State Legislature about required request. I
tested before then young congressman Albert Gore about banning organ sales in
1984, in the House. It had to be one of the first congressional testimonies; maybe
Dan or Will or somebody had stumbled in there, but not known to me if they did.
I don't know that they had. I can say this, whether I was the first or not is not so
important as saying that when I went it had the biggest impact at a place like
Hastings. People knew in the field of bioethics that Art is going to testify.

FOX: Are lawyers beginning to become more important in the matrix of bioethics?
CAPLAN: Yes. I still believe that the period of about 1975 to 1985 is the heyday of the
philosophers, but the lawyers are beginning to emerge. They are beginning to
emerge in a couple of contexts. They are starting to litigate the end-of-life care
cases and comment on them in the law reviews. They are starting to appear in the
hospital ethics committee movement, often as counsel, or chairman, or organizer,
or whatever it is. The American Society of Law and Medicine literally is an
equation of lawyers beginning to take off in this time. So yes, lawyers and health
lawyers are coming in, starting to dominate in a way that they will right through
the 1990's.

FOX: Who’s dominating in the 1990's?

CAPLAN: In the '90's doctors come back. The Peter Ubell model, the David Ashe model,
the Robert Perlman model, the Nick Christakis model; the physician-ethicist era
begins to return.

FOX: Where are the economists? Cost containment?

CAPLAN: Never interested. The economists, where are they? They’re running the country,
they don’t have time to be philosophizing.

Messikomer: Arthur, all the people that you identified in the first generation, could you identify
for us one or two people who you think are reflective, as you have been, about the
development of bioethics as a field? And who could articulate that, like you have
done here today? I've heard him do it. I’ve talked to him privately and I’ve heard
him do it. I believe Alex could.

FOX: On some level Dan Callahan has to have done some kind of running analysis. He
put the life of his whole brood of children on the line because he knew somehow
or other that bioethics was going to be something that was going to crystallize and
it was going to be around for a while to come.

CAPLAN: The only reason I don’t say him is because he’s a player, it’s hard to be a reflective observer of his own activities. Alex is a little more distant, that’s why I’m thinking of him. I think Ruth Macklin could and I think Sam Gorovitz could.

You’d have to let Dan tell it as history, not as reflective observations. Whereas if Ruth does it, I think she could say, “I saw these people, I saw this. I was influenced by this. I remember Art, he did this.” She can distance herself.

FOX: Suppose I asked Dan, “How did you know that your children weren’t going to starve to death when you decided that you weren’t going to be an academic philosopher and that you were going to leave the world of editing?”

CAPLAN: He’d bridle. You’d be asking a true question but he’d bridle. (Laughter)

FOX: I’ve always been fascinated by the fact that Dan basically has to have understood certain things, not just made them happen, because otherwise this was a risk to take that was absolutely insane.

CAPLAN: He was off the charts. There have been times that I have been mad at Dan and frustrated with Dan, but I have to say, this is one pretty gutsy guy. He doesn’t even have the Kennedy money behind him, he’s got nothing! It’s almost like this guy in Chicago who announced he’s going to clone somebody. I keep calling him a nut. If Dan had announced in 1967 that he was going to start bioethics in the Hastings Center, I would’ve said, “You’re a nut and we should pay no attention to you!”
And he had a degree like you did and he came from Harvard, a major department.

And he had this Catholic thing that he could’ve pursued. Catholic intellectual type...and Michael Novak did.

And he also could’ve gotten affiliated with a university at the Hastings Center, but he took the stand that he was not going to be affiliated.

They asked and asked and asked. Princeton asked, Columbia asked...nothing. In fact, remind me next time we talk, I’ll tell you what happened when Nestle came and offered us a lot of money to write a report about selling their formula in Africa. Dan’s reaction to that was one of the real high moments of ethics in America, when he threw them out. It was something.