November 18, 1997. Acadia Study of Bioethics in American Society. Interview with Glenn McGee, PhD, Assistant Professor of Bioethics, Center for Bioethics, University of Pennsylvania, and Senior Fellow, Leonard Davis Institute for Health Economics, University of Pennsylvania. The interview is being conducted by Dr. Renée C. Fox, Dr. Judith P. Swazey, and Dr. Carla Messikomer, in Dr. Fox's office, the McNeil Building, University of Pennsylvania.

FOX: Looking at your CV, we know that you were born in Fort Worth, Texas in 1967 so 1 you're exactly thirty years old. We can see where you've had different phases of 2 your training, but before we talk about your education and training, can you tell us 3 a little bit about the kind of family background you come from and how that might 4 5 be relevant to the career you've chosen? I understand, for example, that your father is a theologian. 6 McGEE: There are really two specifically relevant things that have come out of my life that 7 propelled me in this direction. My father had a wonderful life, but as a child I always 8 swore that there was no way I would follow his theological or philosophical or, 9 specifically, ethics, path. He studied Richard Niebuhr at Duke. I was born shortly after 10 he moved to Baylor in 1966 to begin both a course and program of study in ethical issues 11 in medicine. Obviously as a child I didn't know what he was doing. I had no idea. 12 When I did find out what my father did, I didn't think it was very interesting; I admired 13 14 his character without really seeing the point of teaching theology in a religious institution: 15 teaching people how to be a good person and how to think about ethics at the same time left a bad taste in my mouth. I thought it would be more interesting to work in law, but 16

obviously that didn't work out. 17 18 FOX: Your father is a pioneer in ethical issues in medicine? McGEE: 19 Everyone talks about phases in bioethics, but the voices from the theological parts of that are largely lost. Everyone knows about Paul Ramsey and James Gustafson and so 20 21 on. There was an enormously active theological ethics community in the early 1970's and late 1960's, which I've discovered about my father. He was trained as a Southern Baptist 22 in the time when Southern Baptists were still quite liberal and innovative in their 23 24 treatment of theological, political and moral issues. He really created the conversation for this enormous denomination about abortion when it was first emerging, and dealt with 25 26 "end of life" questions and genetic issues. I think in a kind of a silent way that was very influential for me. I spent a couple summers in Washington D.C. at the Kennedy 27 Institute. He was a member of the group that helped to create it, but more important for 28 him he was the person who pushed bioethics into the limelight for the nation's largest 29 protestant denomination. 30 31 FOX: What's his first name? McGEE: Daniel. He spent a lot of his time reading and thinking and studying about these 32 issues. There were things around the house like the Interpreters Bible, but there were also 33 opportunities to listen and see and think about what he was talking about when I was a 34 child. It really sort of took me by surprise to end up working in this area. It wasn't at all 35

36 something planned. 37 FOX: When you talk about this group of theologians you're talking primarily about Protestant theologians? 38 McGEE: Yes, and I do mean theologians because the distinction between them and 39 40 "religionists" sometimes fades when we begin to discuss religion and ethics. It's evident in Jewish moral thought and in Catholic moral thought but among Protestants there is a 41 42 large group of those trained as clergy who are Ph.D. theologians teaching in research 43 universities. He's one of those who is a Baptist but there is a large group of them that study and work together in a Society called the Society for Christian Ethics. It was 44 45 created, I think, in the late 1960's. That really was the breeding ground for the work of the Niebuhr brothers, and of course Ramsey, in debate with Joseph Fletcher, early on in 46 47 conversations about what informed consent might mean or what it might mean to think about using children, in particular, in research. So he was very active in that group. That 48 meant we flew around a lot and a lot of these people's children are my friends. 49 Name some of the other people who were part of that entourage. Of course, there 50 FOX: is Niebuhr and Fletcher and Ramsey and so on. What denominations, for 51 example? Baptist is obviously one important one, but are there other Protestant 52 denominations? 53 The Methodists have long had a group. It's actually quite large. It has issued McGEE: 54

position papers, which is unusual among the Protestant denominations. Now that the Baptists are pretty much fundamentalists, they have a quite active ethics division of the Christian Life Commission, though it is active these days mostly as a house of propaganda. Of course, the Christian Life Commission was once was associated with Martin Luther King and civil rights. My father came to bioethics from political ethics, from those old days of Baptist activism. He wrote a dissertation on political issues and masters' thesis on African American spirituals. That's not so uncommon actually, political philosophers who moved into bioethics out of those concerns.

FOX: One of the interesting things in this regard is the allegation that in the early stages of bioethics it was quite religiously oriented and then it became more secularized. We have never found it to be an accurate portrait. But there were many people in the early era of bioethics who were profoundly interested in religion and who were trained theologians. The point we've always thought was interesting about the way that the conceptual framework of bioethics supposedly developed is that though there was deference paid to certain theologians and even certain metaphysically oriented philosophers like Hans Jonas, bioethics went merrily on creating an analytic philosophy framework in no way influenced by all those

people who presumably were thought to be so important in the early era.

McGEE: I think that's right and that's reflected in what's essentially a mythical

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

construction about the Beauchamp and Childress volume. Supposedly the amalgamation of Beauchamp and Childress meant that theology and metaphysics were meeting the rigors of analytic philosophy. But in fact, that book has only of late come into its importance. At the time it was viewed by theologians as not so much heretical as just sort of a low-ball account of a couple of the important relationships between philosophy and medicine. If you look at citations from its first edition until its fourth edition there's really a kind of a balloon that occurs after clinicians begin to be involved in bioethics and begin to think that easy-to-isolate principles will create the possibility for clinical diagnostic models in bioethics. I think you're exactly right that this transition from theology to philosophy to clinical bioethics really never occurred, or to the extent that it did occur, it occurred in a much more interesting way. My observation has been that the work in theology, while it considered important, politically significant therapies and research trials of the day, was work that was rooted in metaphysics. It was about what it meant to do it well, and what communities and institutions had to be involved in order, to borrow from Dewey, to "reconstruct" medicine. That was the agenda for Joseph Fletcher. I think even when they didn't accomplish that, the voices that have been distilled down to the primary voices of this theological movement do at least reflect echoes of the real conversation that took place among theologians, which was a conversation about reconstructing medicine and science and what that might have meant. When they talked

FOX:

about a bold new future, in the same euphemisms that are used today about genetics, what they had in mind was the real reconstruction of what it meant to be a human being by technological forces. That kind of commentary doesn't occur today. We don't see that sort of work. There is no metaphysics in bioethics; it's been all but lost, in the same way that it's been lost in analytic philosophy and American philosophy departments. I would also agree that the gestures to Jonas and others are largely that and in fact are hardly made.

I trained with Richard Zaner and so that was my diet, but there aren't a whole lot of folks who trained with phenomenologists. In fact, you couldn't do it today. You really couldn't. Zaner is about to retire and that's it. That's the end of that group. He took over Jonas' and Gorovitz's and Dorian Cairns' students from the New School. While there are people today who work in contemporary continental philosophy, it is an amorphous entity, too. It's moved over into the SPEP community where Heidegger and Husserl are studied for reasons primarily targeted around political concerns and with a wholly unrelated agenda about the question of the meaning of the author and so on.

Looking at your CV and the way you were trained, I see not only Dewey. I also see Merleau-Ponty and I see pragmatism. I also see metaphysics peeping through in your articles. That configuration is very different, I would think, from the

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

generations of Callahan or Caplan. Can you tell us how all of that comes together in some kind of a configuration for you? But first, what was the second influence that moved you toward bioethics?

McGEE: The second influence is one that I really didn't realize at all. I was adopted as a child. Only in the last three or four months has it become an explicit influence for me. I'm writing an article right now with Ian Wilmut, the man who cloned the sheep, who has adopted four children of his own and is a very thoughtful man. He and I are working on a paper and a larger monograph about adoption and consensus in reproduction. I have come to recognize how deeply adoption affects you. I didn't have a terrible childhood. It was actually wonderful. I have a sister who, in fact, is also working in bioethics. She trained in theology and is now going to train in medicine. She's a younger sister of mine, Caroline McGee. She's actually at Penn right now doing some research. She's also adopted, but that wasn't an issue we talked about a whole lot. While it wasn't apparently significant, it was something that was meaningful. I don't think it consciously led me to begin to study questions of reproduction, but you don't have to be Freudian to see the obvious connection between my identity and the work that I've done on what the meaning of parenthood is and how it morphs and mutates and so on. How different constructions of parenthood affect children and parents. In fact, having made that connection explicit for myself only quite recently, it's been very useful. The argument that Ian Wilmut and I

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

are making, to move back there for two seconds, is that you can use adoption as a metaphor, in fact even a direct legal analogy, for understanding how unorthodox reproduction can occur. The scholarship about reproduction in our past twenty year bloom has been either of the kind John Robertson does, sort of common law arguments about the rights of fertile parents as opposed to the infertile--they should be able to do whatever they want, the so-called "back of the Cadillac" analogy--or argumentation about the rights of children. First of all, it's framed, as is all common law, in terms of adversarial characteristics. Mother versus fetus. Child versus parents. Future generations versus the present. More importantly, the emphasis has been, so far, on these two very different, completely incommensurable ways of thinking, both of them conceived in analytic philosophy. The question of how much right one has to reproduce is being understood as an unspoken, un-argued for natural right. And the question of whether the fetus has rights and privileges and future generations have rights and privileges is advanced, sort of thoughtlessly, out of the state of embryology. There is, obviously, much progress in embryology but there isn't argumentation about what that progress means in the bioethics literature, such as it is. So we wanted to argue that there are some areas where there's consensus. Where the conversation isn't incommensurable. The area where it's most clear, where society agrees about unorthodox reproduction, is adoption. In every state in the country when one has a child through this relatively

150 unorthodox mode of reproduction, you have to present yourself to a judge, to a 151 magistrate, to some instrument of local conversation about the limits. Even though it is 152 quite limiting for these parents, it's a restriction on their liberties and so on, it's done in the interest of the child and with the understanding that you don't go into unorthodox 153 relationships where children are concerned, lightly. I think this argument works, frankly. 154 155 Thinking about cloning, this idea that the technology produces moral issues is always problematic. 156 FOX: It is extremely interesting from the point of view of the media. The biographical 157 fact that the scientific "father" of Dolly has four adopted children didn't get into 158 the news. 159 160 The question I asked you before is impossibly phrased. We're interested in the 161 training you had that made you a philosopher, and made you a philosopher not 162 only with the types of interests you have but with the orientation you have. 163 Maybe we could trace out a little bit who you studied with; what particular cross section of philosophy and theology was influential? For example, it seems 164 165 unusual in the repertoire of bioethicists for somebody to have been dealing with Merleau-Ponty. 166 McGEE: 167 When I was an undergraduate, which was a kind of wandering thing for me, I became interested quite early on in the relationship between the environment and social 168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

thought. That much is not unusual. I had a very good mentor at Baylor who worked in Latin American philosophy, Jack Kilgore. In fact, he actually created the American study of Latin American philosophy and popularized texts by people like Unamuno who had not otherwise been studied. He created a special dispensation for me in the philosophy department that would allow me to do a combined project in environmental work, particularly toxicology, agriculture, policy about food, and work in traditional analytic philosophy and its history. Baylor's is a department that's known for the history of philosophy. It's not an especially outstanding school in many respects, but it does have a great philosophy department. I went there planning to be a debater. My enrollment in philosophy was predicated on thinking that philosophy would be a place where you could do environmental work, policy work and thought about thinking, all at the same time. Toward the end of college I began to be interested in the ways in which different philosophers in the American tradition had thought about what environments mean. What it means to flourish, for lack of a better metaphor. In American philosophy Whitehead and John Dewey stand out, although William James and many others have tread on this ground. Dewey and Whitehead both set about what they thought of as a systematic project to reconstruct institutions so that they could think about what it means to flourish and to naturalize our social conceptions like habit and family and ethic in important ways. By naturalize I mean, literally, to see what effect data has on these kinds

188 of claims.

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

FOX: Why is that called "naturalizing"? Is that called naturalizing philosophy?

Bringing data to bear on it?

McGEE: That's an interesting question in itself. Today so-called "naturalizing" philosophy is a kind of a catch phrase in analytic epistemology. They say naturalizing epistemology when they mean facts will be included in the study of philosophy and science. That sounds more cynical than I mean it to be but it's true. When you actually begin to pursue the prospect of thinking about philosophy and science at the same time, a much more radical re-thinking of method is required. Today it is actually quite common for trainees in philosophy of science in analytic schools to take a full complement of science as part of their PhD, but that's only become apparent in the last two or three years. We actually just hired one of those products, a guy named David Magnus. He is fully trained in molecular biology, he is really quite remarkable. Anyway, I was interested not so much in that notion of naturalizing philosophy as the more broad, almost metaphysical understanding. What happens to concepts when you subject them to the state both of science and technology and to the interface between those two things? Whitehead had some very popular work in which he talked about how science was changing the world and education and so on. But the work that I was interested in was quite rigorous, almost impossible to decipher. At Baylor I spent a whole year actually writing a thesis on

	process and reality. I had to create a thesis. Baylor didn't have such a program for
	undergraduates. Process and Reality is a book in which Whitehead argues that
	environments, humans and even natural objects interact in some larger way. At that time
	in my training I was supposed to be very skeptical. You know, Santyana said, "Every
	philosopher at 18 doubts that there is a world." I think that's true or at least it describes
	the pathology that forms philosophy (laughter). In any case, I was interested in
	metaphysics. I became quite entranced with this idea that Whitehead had that experience
	could be used as a descriptive category not only in agriculture and nature more generally
	but in human interactions with agriculture and nature more generally. The sort of
	overriding moral claim that Dewey wanted to make is that you can't really write good
	policy, you can't understand how to create a hospital or develop an appropriate
	educational system, absent some sort of methodically rigorous attentiveness to what the
	goals are of human inculturation, human urbanization and so on. While Whitehead didn't
	do this work, he tried to do the metaphysics that would make it possible.
FOX:	Why wouldn't that have led you to be attracted to social science?
McGEI	E: Well, it did. I thought I was going to go do urban planning. I didn't think I would
	do sociology; I didn't have the training. You had to have an extensive set of prerequisites
	that I didn't have for sociology graduate work. I thought I might do, essentially, the study
	of urban structures. To do theoretical work about what it means to have a city, to have

people together, what it means for them. The multiple metaphors of different social 226 institutions in a city that interact; medicine and education, for example. So instead I did 227 some graduate work in that, under a fellowship. 228 FOX: What is your relationship to your liturgist heritage at this point and when you were 229 being skeptical, metaphysical and sociological all at the same time? 230 231 McGEE: You can be culturally Jewish. I think you can, in fact, be culturally Baptist. I 232 think it may even be necessary. While I wasn't a practicing Baptist I was definitely culturally Baptist and still am. I'm very much involved in activities with the Baptist 233 groups in Philadelphia which were foundationally important for the growth of the 234 moderate Baptist church around the country. There just isn't much Baptist left. 235 FOX: You're often invited to speak in religious contexts. 236 McGEE: Yes and I love that. I really enjoy that. I guess the important thing to say about 237 that is a lot of what soured me on working within theology was the way that theology 238 treated the people who worked in ethics in the 1980's. Another thing that no one has 239 240 mentioned is at a time that bioethics is growing, the full professors and associate 241 professors in seminaries around the country who are doing the scholarship of bioethics 242 were under fire, not just in the Baptist and Methodist circles but even in Catholic circles, in ways that hadn't been seen before, about fetal tissue experimentation and so on. They 243 were being fired. I saw many of my father's friends lose their jobs in incredible ways, 244

245	repreh	ensible. I mean, they'd come in and their office would be cleaned out, the key was	
246	changed. It was unbelievable. The Christian Life Commission which had such a		
247	disting	uished history was emptied out. They were all fired. They are preachers now	
248	across	the country, these Phd's from Harvard and Yale.	
249	FOX:	What decade are we talking about?	
250	McGEE:	This is the late 1970's but mostly the 1980's. That really soured me.	
251	FOX:	Reagan and Bush were in	
252	McGEE:	Exactly, the era of the moral majority which functioned out of a new arm of the	
253	Baptis	t church. I watched these churches as this hysteria kicked in and it's still rolling.	
254	FOX:	So the emphasis was touching more on these taboo topics.	
255	McGEE:	Right. If you're writing about abortion you're particularly vulnerable in a	
256	religio	us institution at a time of social change where religion is felt to be the place of	
257	refuge	against technological progress. I mean, here you are writing in some sympathetic	
258	way ab	out the scientist who might be doing these awful things.	
259	FOX:	So how did you choose Vanderbilt as the place to do your graduate training?	
260	McGEE:	This is the way in which you can say there is a third generation of bioethicists. I	
261	gradua	ted at a time when bioethics as an area of graduate training was really coming into	
262	its owr	n. Georgetown University had graduated several classes of Phd's, all of whom had	
263	found j	jobs in academic circles. At that time there were three big Phd programs in	

bioethics: Rice, Georgetown, and the University of Tennessee, believe it or not. Rice is 264 265 where Tris Englehardt...Rice is really also Baylor Medical Center. Tris and Baruch Brody had been hired there. They had broken the price barrier by giving \$100,000 to a 266 bioethicist. This was the first big appointment and then they dedicated an enormous 267 268 amount of money to bioethics training. All of those people also found jobs. So I 269 graduated at a time when it was actually possible to conceive of doing biological study in ethics. I applied to the big bioethics programs. I also applied to a couple of programs 270 that emphasized continental philosophy because I thought it might be possible to do it in 271 that context as well. I did actually apply to a couple of programs in Germany. 272 FOX: Where would that have been? The continental European emphasis. 273 McGEE: Northwestern University in Evanston, not the medical school. Penn State, which 274 275 is actually now one of the very best philosophy programs. 276 [End of Tape 1, side 1] In any case, I applied to Vanderbilt because Vanderbilt was a place that had 277 McGEE: continental philosophy and pragmatism. It's really the only Phd program in pragmatism 278 279 in the country. The only one, not a matter of better or worse; there really just isn't another one. You could do American philosophy at Southern Illinois University but it 280 281 isn't the best program overall. You could do it at Harvard but I would not have been

admitted due to my uneven record and bioethics aspirations. So there was an issue there.

282

283 And because they had Richard Zaner and I had heard early on from my mentor who knew 284 Zaner that this was a person who did continental philosophy and bioethics and I wasn't 285 going to find another person like that. 286 FOX: What does pragmatism mean? Arthur Caplan sometimes talks about himself as a 287 pragmatic philosopher, but I don't think he is. Whereas you are, technically speaking. It's not just being pragmatic in the popular sense of the term. 288 McGEE: There's so much scholarship about that, but let me say three things in a brief way. 289 290 First, there's this question of what pragmatism means that exists in several institutions, in 291 science and medicine and in philosophy. One set of questions about the meaning of 292 pragmatism is actually not institutionally specific. In science, Kenneth Ryan and others 293 have argued about what pragmatism means. A number of those writing in Science and 294 Nature have actually written op-eds or even extended articles arguing that scientists 295 should be more pragmatic, and by that they mean something different than Arthur means. 296 They mean, typically, that science should move with less regard to social criticism for its 297 foci and for its controversies. That science shouldn't be motivated too much either by sudden funding, windfall funding for some area, or by sudden criticism from different 298 institutions. That's interesting, it's a part of what American philosophers have studied, 299 300 but it's certainly not pragmatism in the scholarly sense. Pragmatism also has a meaning 301 in current contemporary analytic philosophy. There are a number of philosophers, like

Steven Stich, working in the philosophy of biology. Stich is an epistemologist. They use 302 pragmatism as a way of saying that they'll be criticizing certain conventions about eternal 303 norms. For them pragmatism means you are willing to set aside Kantian conventions 304 305 about eternal verities when data appears to the contrary. So this is kind of what I meant when I said naturalizing epistemology earlier. 306 FOX: It's more empirically oriented. 307 McGEE: It's more empirically oriented in the dangerous sense of empirical, because this is 308 scientism, scientistic; it's the criticism of eternal verities with existing data without any 309 310 metaphysical conception of what data means, what the role of data is. Is it anti-theoretical? 311 FOX: I think it is anti-theoretical, in a fundamental sense, both when it's in its ethical 312 McGEE: constellation and its epistemological constellation. Contemporary pragmatism is Richard 313 314 Rorty. Rorty's book, Science in the Mirror of Nature, is probably the best read contemporary book about pragmatism. What it does is to say philosophy as an activity is 315 outdated. It should disappear because these philosophers with their metaphysics have 316 attempted to create a sort of methodical imagination that will never work. It doesn't work 317 318 when it's analytic philosophers with their imagined constructions about data. And it doesn't work when it's pragmatists, early pragmatists. Rorty is critical of everyone who 319 doesn't do what he calls "narrative." It's sort of becoming passé to make this distinction, 320

321	as Ror	ty ages and his work is mollified, but the anti-philosophical Richard Rorty is what
322	a lot o	f folks mean when they say pragmatism.
323	FOX:	But that isn't why you went to study
324	McGEE:	Not at all. No interest in Richard Rorty.
325	SWAZEY:	Is Rorty's version of pragmatism sort of a philosophy analogue to
326	decons	structionism?
327	McGEE:	Interesting question. I'll give you the public perception because that seems to me
328	what y	ou're asking about. You're asking me about how the institutions have
329	incorp	orated it. Rorty does re-readings of Habermas and Heidegger and all those others.
330	His re	cent work, which has been well read, not just in philosophy but in a variety of
331	discip	lines, is about post modern thinking and deconstruction. He makes the claims that
332	are cha	aracteristic of post modern philosophy and deconstruction in particular. He thinks
333	of him	self as in sympathy with Derrida. So yes, Rorty is very much of a kind with a
334	numbe	er of folks who work in deconstruction. They are more imaginative than he is, and
335	read te	exts much more closely, but I think it is fair to say that Rorty is a person who
336	unders	stands the "kinds" of deconstruction. However, that is not what pragmatism is.
337	FOX:	Is this an attack not only on principles and theoretical constructs and so forth, but
338		also on religion? When you talk about eternal verities and so forth it's not
339		particularly aimed in that way?

340 McGEE: No, it's not. In fact Rorty has a ken with the pragmatists of old, with William 341 James for example. Rorty has written a number of articles for trade consumption. He writes in the Republic and Harpers and Atlantic Monthly. He writes articles about 342 tolerance and faith and he makes arguments that do resemble Dewey's "Common Faith" 343 argument or William James' "Varieties of Religious Experience," so he is in sympathy 344 345 with two ideas that are very much in the pragmatic American tradition. In fact, they're in the Emersonian tradition more generally. The spirit of faithful exuberance and the spirit 346 347 of tolerance. I think that while he doesn't seem to be religious himself, in his own argumentation about issues he certainly argues for tolerance and that seems to me 348 something that's very American. Whatever it means, it's very American. 349 FOX: 350 What it is at least that Vanderbilt represented intellectually was not exactly either of these but... 351 McGEE: In 1990 there was a very successful group called the Society for the Advancement 352 of American Philosophy that was started by John McDermott, an American philosophy 353 scholar, in 1964. John McDermott, who is, like Rorty, a public intellectual and an odd, 354 kind of Whitmanesque figure for American philosophy, started the organization along 355 with my dissertation director John Lachs. It has been quite popular, and despite the fact 356 that there aren't Phd programs in American philosophy after the rise of analysis in the 357 1960's and 1980's, there still are thousands and thousands of people who work in 358

359	Ameri	can philosophy around the country.
360	FOX:	Where is this society based?
361	McGEE:	I think it's still based at Harvard. Quine and Hilary Putnam are both founding
362	memb	ers of it. They both had late-age renaissance pragmatism conversions.
363	FOX:	They did? I can't believe that.
364	McGEE:	It is difficult to believe actually.
365	FOX:	Quine's books were in the library of the house I lived in last year at Oxford when I
366		was an Eastman Professor. He was also an Eastman Professor. In fact, one of the
367		early ones. His year at Oxford was a turning point at Oxford which was locus of
368		analytic philosophy, because he actually made analytic philosophy more analytic
369		than it had been before. But I didn't know about this other phase in his life.
370	McGEE:	Yes, this is his conversion experience, his "born again" experience.
371	FOX:	The coming together of Ayre and Quine made for almost a prototypical Anglo-
372		American analytic philosophy.
373	McGEE:	That's actually not unprecedented. Wittgenstein had a similar conversion.
374	FOX:	Bertrand Russell also did. They all had to eventually, I suppose; it just became an
375		impossible thing to sustain for a whole lifetime.
376	McGEE:	I think that's right and I think there are so many questions it doesn't allow one to
377	addres	S.

378	FOX:	Yes, that's right. Bertrand Russell fought all the time against metaphysical issues
379		and had to deal with them in the end anyway.
380	McGEE:	Right, and you can't do it well unless you're at least willing to address other
381	realm	s of human activity.
382	FOX:	Is Harvard still is a citadel of American Philosophy in this sense?
383	McGEE:	It really isn't. There is a William James professorship to reflect the fact that
384	James	taught there in the philosophy department after he was essentially exiled by the
385	medic	al schools.
386	FOX:	These are the well springs of American Pragmatism.
387	McGEE:	Yes. I would argue that we are already beginning to see a real reshaping of
388	philos	ophy in bioethics. I think that whatever bioethics becomes, it's quite clear that
389	everyo	one agrees that principlism is bankrupt. But there aren't many scholars, at present,
390	who g	ive truck to the rough and interesting ontological questions in bioethics. There just
391	aren't	There are a number of scholars who helped construct theoretical questions who
392	are sti	ll around and are still working and are still quite vigorous. But that kind of work
393	has fa	ded to topical work on particular issues. I'm obviously biased, but I think that
394	pragm	atism is the obvious and apparent area of inquiry. It's not so much a theory or a
395	partic	ular argument as it is a way of thinking about the role of philosophy and its
396	partne	rship with complimentary disciplines that make so much more sense for those who

would study philosophy in medicine.

FOX:

I had a short conversation with David Magnus the other day about this and he said that we have already sort of agreed upon admonitions: let us try to incorporate more empirical data into our philosophical thinking, let us take into account the lived experience of medical professionals and families as well as patients and so forth. But is there any theoretical basis? Is there any conceptual framework in American philosophical tradition that would allow us to do this in other than a completely ad hoc way. He said that you and he had been talking about how that might be conceptualized rather than just new rules for doing bioethical thinking.

McGEE:

E: Right. I'm sorry that I'm working three different strings at once here, but another thing that's important about pragmatism in that respect is that pragmatism, in an important sense, is a self-aware cast for philosophical thinking. It literally asks, "What is the role of the philosopher?" as a part of the activity of doing philosophical work, which no other way of thinking about philosophy has in its roots. The question of "What is Metaphysics?" is built into analytic philosophy, of course. What is it to be imaginative? What is the philosopher's job? These are questions that would be discussed at the hiring of an analytic philosopher. But the question of the meaning of the philosopher in the community and in relation to other complimentary disciplines is a question you really need to address methodically and rigorously, and that's at least what American

416 philosophy purports to do. FOX: 417 This could be translated very easily into sociological terms about the social role of 418 the philosopher and the philosopher seen within the context of a larger social 419 system, and so forth. This is very interesting in relation to the issue of the continuing standoff between social science and bioethics. 420 McGEE: We should talk about that a little bit today I think, just to be suggestive, 421 provocative or whatever, because I agree. I think that's very important. What's begged 422 423 there is the question of whether or not philosophers would ever be appropriate within the 424 training of what we might usefully think of as philosophical professionalism. Whether they would ever be useful ethnographers. This question of how that partnership takes 425 place and what it could mean is one that will let me come back to the question of Quine 426 and Putnam and so on. That's what the "real" pragmatist thought and wrote about. And 427 428 by pragmatists, this large group that I was talking about is the group that studies, and I do 429 mean primarily studies, the texts of William James, Charles Saunders Peirce, and John 430 Dewey. Although, it's also the case that Mead and a number of others are among that group that is studied in this tradition. Pragmatists in this sense means classical American 431 philosophers. 432 It also means, in a peculiar way, secularized Protestantism. 433 FOX: McGEE: Yes, I think that's right, but it doesn't have to mean that. 434

No, but when you get a certain kind of old American tradition whether it's FOX: 435 436 Emerson or whether it's these people, this is much more Protestant than the great influence that certain forms of Catholic thought have had in bioethics. 437 McGEE: Right. You have to understand how difficult it is for me to admit that, because to 438 admit that your philosophy is generated within the culture is a quantum admission for a 439 440 philosopher. It's true in a way that doesn't diminish it's value. 441 FOX: The problem is that one of the sources of the impasse between philosophy and social science in bioethics is the assumption on the part of the philosophical 442 443 bioethicists that once you begin to make an analysis of social and cultural influences on thought, you have, in fact, denigrated it. That's that whole business 444 with cultural relativism too. They said that if you start talking about any kind of 445 446 cross cultural analysis, saying "but in Bongo Bongo land they don't think the same way," you impurify the notion of the universalistic ethic that somehow or 447 448 other should rise above being influenced in any way by social and cultural and historical factors. Whereas for social scientists this is not a put down, this doesn't 449 make the thought any less to be respected. It simply is analyzing some of the 450 451 things that created this particular way of looking at the world and reasoning about it. 452 453 McGEE: Right. The more direct analogy would be, suppose that you agreed that the

454	conve	ntions about how ethnography is done were wholly generated by the accidents of
455	your h	sistorical cultural origin. You can see how the disciplines are going to hold.
456	FOX:	The point is that in that kind of philosophical perspective you have to choose
457		between one and the others. But what is the relationship between the training in
458		pragmatic philosophy you got at Vanderbilt and the form that it took in the
459		Harvard context?
460	McGEE:	That's interesting.
461	FOX:	What happened to it when it traveled to Vanderbilt?
462	McGEE:	I was only in graduate school for three years and I had an odd time there. I had an
463	unusu	al graduate training. Vanderbilt, home to Alasdair MacIntyre, John Lachs and other
464	oddba	ll creative types in their prime, is a neat place to have that kind of experience. It
465	was ha	appening for example to Jean Bethke Elshtain when I was there as a student, and I
466	really	got to see her blossom at Vanderbilt. My perspective on how it moved is reflected
467	by my	particular experience at Vanderbilt versus my particular experience with Putnam
4 68	and Q	uine and the geneticist-philosopher people at Harvard.
469	FOX:	That's clear when you see the people around your dissertation.
470	McGEE:	Yes, and I had to appeal for that. When I finished my undergraduate work I
471	moved	d to Nashville a few months early to try to set up a place to live. I was married at
472	that ti	me so she wanted to find a position, and so on. I had a summer to kill. I had

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

history of philosophy training beyond that which is usual for undergraduates. So I petitioned to take my qualifying exams before I began graduate school. No one had ever done that before so they didn't know what to make of it, but they figured they had nothing to lose. In the worst case, they'd find out that I had a lot to learn. So they let me take them and I passed them, which obviated my retaking courses in the history of philosophy. So I had a full three years to take my dissertation English style, as it were. I spent about a year of that time working in pragmatic philosophy at Vanderbilt and at Harvard. I switched back and forth. I spent the first semester doing American philosophy and phenomenology at Vanderbilt with Zaner and the Merleau-Ponty scholar, John Compton, and pragmatism with Locks and a few other pragmatic people there. Then I worked with those at Harvard in the large seminar style courses there. They claim to have more direct access, and I think they can reasonably make a claim, to the text of William James and to the traditions that informed the creation of American philosophy, which are Massachusetts traditions to say the least even if Peirce moved from Vermont, and Royce lived out in the wilderness and so on. The traditions of Thoreau and Emerson and so on are very much informed by that way of living and thinking, and all of its inherent paradoxes and ironies. This was during my first year and during that time I came to the conclusion that

McGEE: This was during my first year and during that time I came to the conclusion that there is not so much to be said about direct inheritance in the American philosophical

tradition. Phenomenology did work that way. 492 493 FOX: How did Chicago get into there? 494 McGEE: Elshtain was at Vanderbilt for two of the years that I was at Vanderbilt and then she took this Rockefeller Chair on that Committee for Social Thought that Leon Kass 495 496 started at Chicago. So she left but she was very helpful for me. She arranged everything 497 for me at Harvard and actually introduced me to Dick Lewontin. So anyway, phenomenology is an interesting thing. It will be interesting to see how bioethics plays 498 out, if it's more like phenomenology or more like American philosophy. In 499 500 phenomenology, the people who did it literally moved here to the New School under 501 pressure relating to World War II. Not only did they have the doctor-father tradition from 502 German philosophy, the way that you were literally trained and mentored in a very direct inheritance fashion. They also were all in the same place basically, although they moved 503 around to different universities for visiting professorships, and some of them actually left, 504 and they trained students quite quickly. There is a general sense in which, even today, 505 people who work in Husserl will tell you that their mentor is the mentee of Husserl. 506 That's considered to be very important and there is a direct inheritance that is mirrored in 507 some other disciplines. American philosophy is not like that at all, predictably. 508 509 FOX: Psychiatry, psychoanalysis is the same thing. The same kind of migration.

510

Everybody analyzed everybody else. Were there certain dissident Protestants and

511		certain Catholics as well as Jews among the phenomenologists who migrated and
512		made their home in the New School?
513	McGEE:	Yes, Catholics and Jews. I don't think there were Protestants. Not that I know of,
514	thoug	th Dorian Cairns might have been Protestant. In any case, the point was that I took
515	my tr	aining in philosophy thinking that the American philosophical tradition would be
516	this v	way also. I was training with Zaner and it was appropriately passed down from
517	gener	ation to generation. But in American philosophy who did you go study with? I felt
518	like I	was in a good place to study it but I was looking for some sort of mentor. In fact,
519	there	really isn't one. In American philosophy the tradition is that one doesn't have a
520	strong	g mentor. I did actually have one anyway in Lachs.
521	SWAZEY:	Emersonian(laughter)
522	McGEE:	Exactly! It's some combination of frontier mentality and interdisciplinary
523	schol	arship.
524	FOX:	In a peculiar way, when I think of the courses in American literature, in some
525		ways you could have found a mentor more in English or American thought than
526		you could in philosophy.
527	McGEE:	I think that's right, although it's happenstance. But they don't do the readings of
528	Dewe	ey. Cornell West has made this argument that finally everything descends from
529	Emer	son and that there is a kind of a genealogical tree pattern for American philosophy,

and that you can get at it better in American Studies or Literature. I don't think that's true. I actually think that a lot of the work that's done by people like Dewey that was so instrumental in setting up interrelationships between education, sociology and philosophy at, for example, Chicago, could not have taken place apart from his rooting in the philosophy department and his training in philosophical method. He was really arguing against problems in German idealism in the early part of his career and moved out of that.

FOX: When I think of my own training prior to becoming a sociologist it was in this American tradition. Primarily, I spent my whole junior year reading nothing but these American writers that we're talking about. I'm also beginning to see something else, which is the coming together of Chicago and New York and now

American tradition. Primarily, I spent my whole junior year reading nothing but these American writers that we're talking about. I'm also beginning to see something else, which is the coming together of Chicago and New York and now New England comes into the picture. The phenomenologists find a home in the New School and also Dewey at Columbia, and Chicago's Committee on Social Thought has turned out to be an important locus if you do the real history of American bioethics. Then we bring into this what you call the "public intellectual" and think about the social groups in Chicago and New York which also are conducive to the role of the "public intellectual". The New York Review of Books world is going to turn out to be relevant to bioethics too.

McGEE: Absolutely, and in a rich way. This idea that bioethics has a thirty year history that involves friends of Callahan and descendants of Callahan is very shallow. The

549	conco	mitant claim that bioethics came from the folks who worked in Civil Rights is true
550	but it'	s also false. There are all these other folks who worked on institutions in American
551	culture	e who have a rich history of fighting against Imperialism, and in that connection,
552	thinki	ng about how much resource has to be devoted to the military, what metaphors have
553	to be ı	used in educating children and so on. The whole house of Chicago.
554	FOX:	The peace movement is a very important part of this, isn't it?
555	McGEE:	That's right. I guess the general point is that there's a much richer institutional
556	history	y than is obvious.
557	FOX:	Yes. I certainly don't go along with the allegations that, for example, bioethics
558		began in Seattle Washington with the visit of Shana Alexander to the Northwest
559		Kidney Center.
<b>56</b> 0	McGEE:	Yes. As David Rothman did in Strangers at the Bedside, you can force events to
561	fit and	I it works quite nicely in explaining the rise in popularity of bioethics. And the rise
562	of Art	hur Caplan's media thing, being there when the media needs comment on a scandal.
563	That p	phenomenon works. I think his is the correct history of how the increase in interest
564	in rese	earch and the increase in potential for explosions led to certain sorts of explosions
565	and th	en bioethics
566	FOX:	It fits completely into the paradigm of biomedical events or biotechnological
567		events causing certain ethical questions to occur, which then calls forth a

568 response. END OF TAPE (TAPE 1) 569 I'm not going to ask for a ballpark figure, but of the vast numbers of people now 570 FOX: participating in bioethics and even, let's say, among those we consider to be the 571 top level intelligentsia of bioethics, how many do you think really have the kind of 572 intellectual perspective on the development of the field and its deep rootedness in 573 American culture? Frankly, this is the first such conversation of this kind we've 574 575 ever had with anybody. Is this something that a number of people understand reasonably well, but somehow or other bioethics is dealing on an everyday level 576 with practical problems so they don't get around to displaying this? Or is this 577 suppressed, or is there a lot of intellectual ignorance, so to speak? Let's put it 578 another way, do you have discussions like this with your peers? 579 McGEE: No, we don't, but there are several levels of peer group. The Penn Bioethics 580 Center is an anomaly There is nothing like it anywhere else in the world. I'm very much 581 confident of that. And it's not just that the leader is so well known and so interesting. 582 It's this idea of bringing together a group of people with no prior experience in bioethics 583 per se, in a sort of "sink or swim" academic environment. It's now a very large group. 584 585 FOX: I can't believe the number of undergraduates who are working over at the Center for Bioethics. 586

587	McGEE:	Oh yes! There are thirty undergraduate students. We are as large as many good
588	sized	departments in regular disciplines. So we're unusual. I don't have the same kinds
589	of co	nversations here that we'd have around the country, but I think the emerging state of
590	the ar	t, as it were, is such that the emphasis and energy in bioethics today is devoted to
591	explo	ring particular technologies and particular treatments, one at a time. There's a lot of
592	emph	asis on the end and beginning of life, and on managed care, in this regard.
593	SWAZEY:	This is very new.
594	McGEE:	This is very new. These are areas that are all receptive to survey analysis, survey
595	studie	es.
596	FOX:	And the one that doesn't go away, ever, which is one of the cradles of bioethics,
597		human experimentation.
598	McGEE:	Yes. Human experimentation, oddly enough, has been folded into the different
599	areas	It isn't treated as a discreet area of study.
5 <b>0</b> 0	FOX:	It is still in The Bibliography of Bioethics, but never the less, it cross cuts
501		everything.
502	McGEE:	Yes, it does. Going back to bioethics centers, there were a number of Centers set
503	up in	the mid 1980's, a lot of them. Hundreds of them around the country in medical
504	cente	rs and tertiary care hospitals and to a lesser extent, in regional medical networks and
505	even	denominational groups. Many of these Centers for the Study of Bioethics or some

similar sort of aggregation have either closed already or are in the process of closing. In 606 607 part for a reason that Art talks about a lot, which is the vulnerability of their funding. They're usually thought of as overhead. He probably talked to you about this. 608 609 FOX: Methodologically speaking, I don't think it just the ebullient personalities and the brilliance of the bioethicists we have interviewed so far. It's even something 610 interesting to write about. I don't think sociologists or historians are necessarily 611 accustomed to doing interviews with persons who not only have high IQ's but are 612 first-class intellectuals. In addition to telling the story of where you went to 613 graduate school and what your father's occupation was, you can actually discuss 614 ideas and the sociology of knowledge; the history of ideas aspect of this is of great 615 importance to us. 616 **SWAZEY**: Glenn, let me go back to Renée's question. If you wanted to have a discussion 617 618 such as the one we're having, about the intellectual roots of bioethics and the various 619 philosophical traditions, who could you have this discussion with? Well, that's tough. The corollary to that question is, "Who would be a good 620 McGEE: 621 mentor?" When you talk to young people who want to go to graduate school, it's an enormously important question. I think that kind of knowledge would be the sort of 622 623 knowledge that would make one a good mentor. I might add that you can't have this kind of discussion with people in social 624 FOX:

science any more either. 625 McGEE: Really? 626 In my generation you could've had it, but basically people aren't being trained any 627 FOX: 628 more in the history of ideas and so forth. But I think Judy was asking about your contemporaries; is there a new generation of bioethicists, sort of a thirty-629 something group? Can you see people on the horizon who represent minds like 630 your own, where if you had the time to do it, you might sit down and have a 631 discussion like this? 632 That's not a large group. There is a group of people who work in this field who 633 McGEE: are at this level, who have been identified within a group that publishes in roughly the 634 same literature. Everyone reads everyone else's literature, aiming at certain sorts of 635 activities. That's actually not a large group but it is a fairly well identified group, believe 636 it or not. We have a summer camp that we put together. There are two summer camps. 637 There's the big bioethics summer camp which interestingly enough Caplan set up. It's 638 great and that's the sort of place where this kind of conversation would likely take place, 639 even as a matter of lore, over a beer. The kind of conversation we're talking about is not 640 what characterizes the group that I work with. This is one of the reasons why I'm 641 642 reluctant to talk in personal terms, because I don't want you to think that I'm a paradigm

643

case. I'm not at all.

644 The training that is characteristic for the group that I work with is medical training. Most of the people who work in bioethics who were trained in the last 645 ten years were trained as physicians. They received their training in bioethics in a 646 masters program like ours at Penn, or did some sort of interdisciplinary work or 647 648 took a masters or Phd in philosophy or anthropology. That's a very small group 649 now, maybe thirty people. Most of them are physicians; there are only a few who are philosophers. There are more jobs in bioethics that require philosophical 650 651 training than there are applicants. It is the fastest growing area in philosophy. 652 FOX: So the philosophy departments have stopped their standoff with regard to bioethics? 653 McGEE: 654 Well, it's not that there's a standoff, it's just that the students don't want it. Students go into philosophy to do something else entirely and they aren't attracted to 655 656 bioethics. You could talk with philosophy graduate students at Penn and you'd see that they just don't like it. It's not real. Philosophy of medicine even isn't real because it's 657 658 not well developed enough to really address the big issues, like what one can know. It's very different, not akin at all to theoretical ethics, which is a discipline that has advanced 659 660 quite a lot in Britain but not so much in the U.S. since Rawls. FOX: So the new generation of bioethicists would be physician-ruled. 661 662 McGEE: Mostly physicians. There are a few others. I would suggest one particular person,

if I were suggesting people's names. Todd Chambers is a Phd who teaches at 663 Northwestern Medical School. He's very thoughtful and very insightful and trained as a 664 665 Phd in world religions and then began to work with the group that I think is most humanistically oriented. 666 FOX: This is the Nicholas Christakis generation we're talking about; they're thirty-five 667 and have double training and so forth. But also it's an irony to be discussed some 668 669 other time, because medical schools themselves, which would probably be the major place where such people would do this kind of teaching and research, don't 670 understand what bioethics is. They don't know the difference between 671 philosophy, social science, psychiatry, history or anything else. 672 McGEE: I think that's exactly right. I can speak to that specifically. I was recruited this 673 674 last year by Emory University, which has still not done anything in bioethics. They have a very strong department of theology and they have a Center for Ethics that's run by a 675 676 theologian named James Fowler, who works on this whole business of applying growth 677 and mental state psychology to medical problems. Like Donald Self, who also does this, who's been around for about twenty years. But in any case, he doesn't really work in 678 bioethics. They wanted to set up a Bioethics Center and I had a long series of 679 conversations that actually continue to this day about what they might do there. They're 680 681 in an interesting situation because Gustafson has just retired, and they really need

682	someth	ning and someone. So the kind of conversation I had at Emory, a lot like what I
683	imagin	e the conversations have been in other medical schools where they've hired
684	bioethi	cists, really is very indicative. Today the credentials for a bioethicist have nothing
685	to do v	with disciplinary identity, they have to do with practice and talents and skills.
686	FOX:	Except you can have a conversation like the one we're having with James
687		Gustafson.
688	McGEE:	Absolutely.
689	FOX:	He knows how this is rooted in American cultural tradition, he has a brother
690		who's a sociologist, he has trained many people who grew up to be bioethicists,
691		but is very critical of many of the attributes of it, and is a good theologian.
692	McGEE:	Yes, he's very good.
693	FOX:	But we're talking about somebody who's seventy not somebody who's thirty.
694		Emory is not typical either because Emory has always had an extremely strong
695		divinity school, a strong medical school and a strong law school. Because of the
696		Southern influence there is also a non-timidity about having the things that the
697		divinity school is concerned with have some relationship to medicine and even to
698		the public domain. What happened when you went to be interviewed?
699	McGEE:	It's interesting. The qualifications that a health system pursues in bioethics are
700	really	different than the qualifications that one might have seen five or ten years ago. The

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

folks who were graduating from Georgetown at the time that I started graduate school went into positions primarily in philosophy departments where they were going to be considered for tenure track, and thus the products they would be expected to produce would be five, six, seven journal articles and perhaps a book and a few book reviews. Public lectures would not have been emphasized. This philosophy role had a lot to do with the shaping of the bioethicist's intellectual and public life. Health systems have a completely different kind of goal: they want the fire department; that is, they want to find a way to use bioethics to control emergent public problems. So it's on the analogy to the risk manager in the hospital. You could argue that's a defensible role for the bioethicist if you didn't consider the conflict of interest that's inherent in taking such a position. You always write from a position of conflict within that situation. When you begin to cash out that role for an actual young scholar what that translates to is enormous opportunity and access to clinical programs, which is great. Enormous opportunity to think about emergent technologies in a very rigorous way, but at the same time you have the same sort of allegiance that a transplant team member has to the transplant team, right? Your success or failure is tied in to the failure or success of the program, so being critical of the activity is possible only within two kinds of constraints that the new bioethics does not allow. One is the structure of tenure. Almost everyone I know who works in bioethics today is in a non-tenure track position or a tenure track position where there is no hard

720 money. FOX: Are you in a tenured position? 721 McGEE: No, but I am in a long-term funded position. 722 FOX: Because one of the things about your CV that is really fascinating is that if one 723 reads it in terms of the convention of what has he done that will get him a full 724 725 professorship, a lot of things like your international lectureships and your public 726 role and what you call your public service presentations, though admirable, would be totally irrelevant to the profile of a person who's imbedded in the academic 727 728 world who's hoping to get ahead. Do you think that these are things that are given credit in the role of the new bioethicist? 729 730 McGEE: In this sense, I am typical. You praise it provocatively. I think there are three different things that are happening. One is that the publication conventions of the 731 732 medical school are being exported to bioethics. I know to receive tenure at Penn, which now that I'm on the standing faculty, I can receive, but I'm probably two or three years 733 away from asking to receive it, you have to have 33 publications. Now, imagine a world 734 735 in which a philosopher would generate 33 publications in seven years. What that means 736 is the activity of writing, thinking and publishing changes. It's not so much the pursuit of the least publishable unit, the so-called LPU, which is definitely a part of bioethics. You 737 look at my colleagues, even my senior colleagues. The review-period process in 738

philosophy is a year for an article. 739 740 FOX: Would publications in other than what they usually call refereed journals count? McGEE: I think so, although it depends. In my own career I'm counting on the tenure 741 742 group to count law school publications, which are not peer reviewed. I'm not counting on 743 their accepting media stuff but I think it is important that they recognize public activity. 744 I'm very unabashed about that. I think that it's important. This is part of the claim that I 745 see that William James is making. It's not so much that the intellectual should be in the 746 public eye. The more overriding claim is that the intellectual life should involve at least some publication in the trade press or to the general media, so that ordinary people 747 748 receive the research. If you do that, if you even intend to do that, the way you do your 749 scholarly work changes, because you can't think in quite the same way about your 750 hypothesis that you'll be testing on your research goal. You may have the times on your side, in the sense that I suspect that one of the 751 FOX: 752 many ways in which Arthur has been a great gift to the University of Pennsylvania 753 is the fact that he is in the public domain all the time; he represents, in the best 754 sense of the term, an enormous PR asset to the University of Pennsylvania 755 Medical Center.

McGEE: Going back to the three ways in which my CV is typical, if bioethics is to survive within the health system it has to demonstrate to the health system that it produces

756

757

something other than articles in <u>Cell</u>, <u>Science</u> and <u>Nature</u>, which is valuable for the activities of the health center more generally.

FOX: When you talk about public activity, though, it's different from clinical bioethics.

McGEE: That's right...which would be the third thing. Some bioethicists, young colleagues of mine who are also right at that stage where they're about to come up for tenure, are using teaching for this role. Teaching in medical schools, as you know, is an odd thing. You don't really teach a semester-long class. You teach a couple of sessions and so to really demonstrate that you are valuable you have to teach your brains out. You do a different lecture to a different class every day, and so you develop this unbelievable list of courses that you teach and sessions and so on. Part of the activity that's become valuable for bioethics people, no matter how they're trained, is to be seen as THE representative of bioethics teaching in the medical school, at a time when the medical schools are not putting money into teaching anyway, right? Look at Penn's curriculum 2000: it's not smoke and mirrors but it's close. Because without devoting any money to the curriculum even things like anatomy get lost, let alone something like a real curriculum in interdisciplinary medical practice. You can't do that unless you bring in the literature professor to actually do the work.

You can say that this generation is struggling with what it will mean to know enough about medicine to teach it or alternatively to know enough about

ethics to teach it. And so you have this movement in from two poles by Kennedy 777 Institute-trained scholars in bioethics. This is the reason why I didn't do 778 779 Kennedy; I didn't do bioethics as training because I wanted to do history of philosophy. 780 FOX: But you also have had the conviction that you can't do the ethics of medicine 781 without knowing a considerable amount about certain areas of medicine in which 782 783 you're going to work in depth. 784 McGEE: That's right, but I think it goes beyond that. I think people who work in bioethics 785 have to be incredibly careful about what they're willing to say about technologies to the media, and so on. It's so easy to be glib about the latest, most interesting item, but I 786 frankly won't talk about anything that is not in my area of research to anybody, let alone 787 the media. Just because it's too dangerous and it's too tempting, and that is also a new 788 challenge for this new group of bioethicists. And, by the way, this is a new group that is 789 790 not getting any training in media relations or journalism more generally, or for that 791 matter, teaching. Whether they are physicians or philosophers, they're still being trained without training in teaching. Nobody gets that, especially not in bioethics. 792 The training that bioethicists get is training in clinical rounding, and that's 793 this third area too. Service to the hospital or to the health system about clinical 794 ethics, consultation, helping with ethics committees, creating some sort of 795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

deliberative body so that when somebody needs a liver they'll be there to talk about what that means. That sort of combination entrepreneurial consulting role and ethnographic observation role is something that philosophers clearly are not prepared at this time to perform. By the same token, physicians are even less prepared to do it. There is a huge fight in bioethics about this, of course. I would say it is most characterized by an exchange between Mark Siegler, on the one hand, and a group of philosophers on the other. Siegler argued in the early 1980's and then recanted and then went back to the position that "philosophers and others can only have counterfeit courage of non-combatants;" that's an actual quote. Because their work in the clinic is never really work that is responsible to patients. By contrast, philosophers argued that physicians have no training for thinking about what it really means to be accountable to patients and their thinking in disease terms prevents them from even doing the things that nurses do. That used to be, or ought to be, a part of what it means to be appropriately charged with the patient's rights. In the middle of this is this question about who is supposed to do a consult and what it's supposed to mean. There's an enormous amount of deliberation about this and it is something that is very interesting and important to me. Zaner was the first person to do clinical consultation. He really created clinical ethics but he did it as a phenomenologist, which is to say his training was

exactly in thinking about what it meant to have relationships between professionals and between human beings, when intersubjectivity created problematic dimensions in human expression. These were issues about human relationships more generally. So Zaner was interested in specific kinds of things like the dreams that transplant patients have and pre-fantasy variation as a theory and how it applies to dream experiences in patients. The idea that he would be called in to help with some emergency, the so called "beeper ethics," never occurred to him, nor did he ever prepare for it, or for that matter prepare me for it. One idea about how clinical ethics might work is this very long term investment in a particular clinical setting. George Agich, also a phenomenologist by training, has written about this in a great piece. He says there are really three kinds of clinical ethicists: the watcher, the witness, and some amalgam of participant roles. The watcher and the witness have obvious anthropological derivations, but the participant role is one that until, I guess, the early 1990's everybody thought you should not really take. Do they think they should now? McGEE: I think so, yes.

END OF SIDE (TAPE 2)

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

FOX:

McGEE: 833 Clinical ethics now involves training large numbers of clinicians, physicians and 834 nurses, although it used to be just physicians, to do white-coat clinical ethics consults. FOX: That's not so worrisome as the philosopher who is going to be the clinician, is it? 835 McGEE: 836 I think it's as or more, although I think most people agree with you. I actually 837 disagree. I think it's as or more problematic because most of the physicians who do it do 838 not have any serious skill in the kind of research that would be necessary to know when 839 you are giving good advice. I have heard such irresponsible, really scary advice from 840 physician ethics consultants. I actually think that it's much more dangerous. There isn't 841 a troop of philosophers anxious to be in this role; there are actually a very few who want 842 to do it. It's hard to get a philosopher to do an ethics consult because most of them are 843 scared to death. The physicians have their boots on and are ready to go; most of them 844 think this is something you can learn in three weeks through the Kennedy Institute 845 summer course. Another thing about this group of physicians being trained to do bioethics is the 846 FOX: 847 question of how much they continue in a clinical role. Some of the people I've 848 trained, I have to keep...not arguing with them but encouraging them not to lose too much contact with being a doctor who takes care of patients. Not because I 849 850 just think it's a virtuous thing to do but because they are going to undo their value 851 if they now become a philosopher and they're no longer doing enough clinical

852 work, or become a sociologist who doesn't see patients any more except 853 occasionally for some research that they're doing. It may be that the interdisciplinary thing they are trying to straddle means that their judgement even 854 855 as a non-philosophically thoughtful physician begins to be thinned out by virtue of the fact that they are more and more subtracting themselves from patient care. 856 857 McGEE: That has happened. I think that, however you want to count generations, the second generation physicians have that problem more than the third generation does. The 858 second generation, Tris Englehardt, and so on, never wanted to go into the clinic in the 859 860 first place. Tris Englehardt I always thought of as an example of somebody who was a FOX: 861 862 wonder because he went through all the medical training and did not get 863 socialized into becoming a physician. He never internalized anything. If you 864 didn't know that Tris Englehardt had been through medical school, you would 865 never guess it. Not because of biomedical knowledge. It's really a phenomenon worth studying: how somebody can go through such intensive training and not 866 undergo any attitude learning. Now, he may have done that by intent. 867 McGEE: I think by intent. He never intended to practice. Pelligrino practiced medicine for 868 many, many years, and he doesn't have philosophical training but he functions in that 869 870 way.

FOX:

He's an important image and figure and so forth. I think about him and smile with a kind of gentle smile, because I see him as perfectly fitting his whole story that he became the president of Catholic University for a while, which is probably one of the most important things that's ever happened to him. He does have a sort of Franciscan personality and he also has a huge family. From a movie casting point of view, Ed looks like you should be looking if you're going to live the life of the thoughtful philosopher-physician. He does not have the deep training in philosophy or theology though he has moved in certain kinds of religious and philosophical circles all of his life and feels very much at home in thinking about moral issues and existential issues and so forth.

McGEE: I guess that is to say he is first generation; no question, he is first generation. He actually brought the first bioethicist into the hospital. The second generation had more of a complete transition of the kind we're talking about from the one place to the other because the positions that they assumed either were in different departments outside the medical school or were positions into which they moved from their clinical work. Today, physicians trained in fellowship programs at Chicago or Pittsburgh are quite likely to take on ordinary tenure track jobs in medical schools. Most of them go into internal medicine although there are some in geriatrics and pediatrics and so on. They still have patient loads and then they try to buy themselves research time.

FOX: The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation played a very big role in training this 890 generation of physicians we're talking about. And the Chicago Program also. 891 892 McGEE: The problem for the physician-ethicist trained today is not that they'll leave their 893 patients and not have touch with the real clinical world, sort of writing from a bottle. The 894 problem with the generation of today is that the training and the job don't allow for much reflection. The training is very intense, directed either at clinical ethics consultation or at 895 refining research skills for essentially combining their epidemiological work with 896 bioethics work. Survey studies and so on, that's what they really teach at Chicago. 897 That's sort of the training route. Then once one begins practice there is an enormous 898 amount of pressure to publish these 33 or 40 articles in order to receive tenure. 899 FOX: There also is an enormous amount of pressure given to what's happening to 900 academic medical centers. The patient loads they have to carry. They have to 901 902 make money for the Center, they have to be productive in terms of how many 903 patients they take care of. 904 McGEE: Patients or grants, one or the other. Either of those are time intensive. It's not 905 conducive to a great family life, frankly. This is sort of a side note, but I think it's not that the pressures are greater on this group but the pressures are twenty four hours a day 906 almost. This is a group, particularly the physician-ethicists, who don't have time for 907 family life and so the divorce rate is astonishing. All of my friends are divorced, with the 908

909	except	ion of a couple of folks.
910	FOX:	They're also on soft money and have to generate hundreds of thousands of dollars.
911	McGEE:	Right. Even on tenure track.
912	FOX:	This is not just the ones who are in ethics. Somewhere along the line, Judith, we
913		need to flag the way in which the developing field of clinical epidemiology comes
914		into this, because it is an interesting group of medical intellectuals. It's a place
915		which has permitted physicians to keep a positivistic enough face to not lose
916		status in the medical school, and to either be philosophers or social scientists in
917		disguise or try to do some philosophy or social science at the same time that they
918		are quantitatively oriented and seem to be doing real science.
919	McGEE:	There are very good groups of folks doing that at Penn. Jon Baron's decision
920	science	es group is almost a lab. It's phenomenal to watch that evolve. You really just
921	nailed	it, the way you described it. That's every aspect of the way it works.
922	FOX:	I think that they are genuinely attracted to this field. It's a very exciting field from
923		a point of view of the quality of the minds in it. It has struck me for quite a while
924		that if you really wanted to succeed as a sort of social scientist or philosopher in
925		disguise in the medical school and not be considered to be less scientific, the way
926		to do it would be to do a certain kind of clinical epidemiology.
927	MESSIKOME	ER: Glenn, you started to discuss your perception that the Penn Bioethics

Center is an anomaly compared to other centers. You also said that bioethics puts its energy and emphasis on one issue at a time, and mentioned end of life decisions and managed care as topics that are particularly receptive to quantitative examination. Could you come back to these points?

McGEE: I wanted to say that they appear to lend themselves to a more quantitative approach. The leap of faith that Caplan made with this Center is that if you brought in young, aggressive, quantitatively oriented social science types and allowed the tools of survey measurement to run wild in areas like human research, genetics and so on, information would be generated that might otherwise remain as un-argued for assumptions about how things are. In fact that's turned out to be true. Many of my colleagues are now funded. The Center, as a gamble, seems to have paid off, with \$2 million in NIH grants in the last month. But there were tight times. The money was running out and three or four of my colleagues were going to leave. So it seems, at least in the short term, to have paid off, but the apparent possibilities for success here are with this kind of methodology. It's an interesting phenomenon because it is certainly the case that you can study informed consent with questionnaires. You can go out and ask people what they know and what they don't know. You can construct a study. It looks clear that this is an area that there should have been some questionnaire studies or survey analysis

about how these things are actually perceived. What the real effects are of genetic discrimination, for example, across large populations. And so some of that work is being done. The more long term work of analyzing how practices have changed in science and how this sort of medicine is practiced along side that science is not being done. I suspect that's what this fight is about. There are anthropologists and ethnographers who work in this area who even now are beginning to say they do bioethics.

FOX:

What I gather happened recently--Arthur mentioned it on the telephone in passing—is that the anthropologists said to the sociologists, "We have paid serious attention to these bioethical issues for a long time and you don't pay any attention to us. You act as if we don't even exist." Actually, the kind of medical anthropologists we're talking about are quite justified. They did come into this area for a whole series of reasons that have to do with what the field of anthropology was facing and so forth. It even ties up with feminism to some extent. But anyway, when we looked at some of the small research proposals that were submitted for Arthur to fund through the Centers, we turned down a few of them because however clever they were from the point of view of quantitative methodology, they needed to have some exploratory qualitative research done about the phenomena that they were writing these fancy studies of. Some of those things were not fundable, even at the \$2,000 level, precisely because the

965		methodology out-wagged the substance. Which is what happens in sociology all
966		the time too.
967	McGEE:	I fear the search for rigor in NIH in work on social science and ethics; there is no
968	rigor tl	here.
969	FOX:	Not their definition of rigor.
970	McGEE:	Exactly. The study sections that are going to determine how ethics work looks in
971	the NI	H are still in the very early stages. I've spent a lot of time recently arguing about
972	peer re	eview in science, and peer review of genetics studies in particular. The question
973	that I t	hink is up now for debate is how peer review of ethics-related, medicine-related
974	proces	ses is to take place.
975	FOX:	Particularly because we come back to the whole question of whether bioethics is a
976		discipline. It's hard to define competence in this area, and also which or with a
977		great array of disciplines working in this area, what combination of elements
978		would you choose to review a particular proposal.
979		What I would like to do with Glenn the next time is talk about, among
980		other things, his role with regard to things like the student interest group, the
981		Society for Health and Human Values, the junior summer camp, and his role in
982		bringing together younger people entering with serious interest in bioethics.
983	McGEE:	Sure! That's actually another area where Art and I have very different opinions.

984	The b	eattle for what will count as a professional society in the area of study of philosophy	
0 2 5	of medicine is very interesting. Health and Human Values is a wonderful organization. It		
986	begar	n in the early 1970's.	
987	FOX:	Arthur didn't seem to know that it began as a Protestant group here in	
988		Philadelphia.	
989	SWAZEY:	There's a wonderful soft covered book they put out about their history.	
990	McGEE:	That would be interesting to read. I have several of their earliest programs. I think	
991	that is	s an interesting and very distinguished history. By contrast, if you look at the recent	
992	histor	ry of organizations in bioethics and the way that the splinter occurred that formed the	
993	AAB	, that's going to need multiple perspectives because as much as it's about the egos	
994	FOX:	They decided to merge, I gather, at the meeting in Baltimore.	
995	McGEE:	They're all merging together again. They should never have split up in the first	
996	place	, but this idea that the rigorous analytic philosophy was what bioethics meant and	
997	that's	what this organization should be now	
998	FOX:	There also is this peculiar split in the Society for Health and Human Values	
999		because there's this whole literature group. All my friends who are writers go to	
1000		these meetings, who are doing literary non-fiction and so forth, because this is a	
1001		good place to meet writers and publishers. One thing we also need to talk about,	
1002		which didn't come up in your discussion although we mentioned the word once, is	

1003		this whole narrative ethics movement, the storytelling thing: the way it was meant
1004		to be and the way it is being used and so forth with everybody running around
1005		talking about the superiority of telling stories rather than
1006	McGEE:	There's an article you probably have read in the new issue of Medical Humanities
1007	Reviev	w by the director of the Case Western Center, Tom Murray, which claims to sort it
1008	all out	. I am a devotee of Martha Nussbaum at Chicago. She is a current pragmatist
1009	actuall	ly, she's a good example.
1010	FOX:	She's a better philosopher than most people. She's one of the best philosophers.
1011	McGEE:	She is outstanding! Very thoughtful, understands the classical history of
1012	philoso	ophy.
1013	FOX:	And she's recognized internationally; for example, she's revered in Australia and
1014		in England.
1015	McGEE:	Her work continues to be amazing. The point is that Tom Murray is citing her
1016	withou	ut, I think, understanding her work. He makes some claims about how narrative
1017	might	work and tries to do what philosophers do, make distinctions between different
1018	purpos	ses of narratives. But what underlies all this is, again, the question of what the
1019	philoso	opher's research is. What does it mean, as a philosopher working in a health care
1020	comm	unity, to do research? This is a real problem for me. Here I am in a very large
1021	group.	Art is Art, and then there is this enormous group of others with whom I work who

1022	do res	search. They write a grant proposal before they do their work, then they do their
1023	work	. The way that they present their work is not amenable to normative conversation.
1024	You	present your findings and discuss your findings, but the question of advancing a
1025	mora	l position is itself an issue for them. I hadn't even called what I do research.
1026	Philo	sophers don't call it research, although we do research. So what it is that we say that
1027	we do	when we're telling stories, as it were, becomes very important. It's easy to make
1028	false	claims. The so called thick description that everyone cites all the time isn't real. All
1029	it is is	s to use an anecdote of varying depth. I think Nussbaum is a good person to turn to
1030	for th	at kind of question. But the kind of training she has and the way she uses that
1031	traini	ng to produce accounts of phenomena globally
1032	FOX:	If you did a content analysis of the way in which the concept of ethnography is
1033		written about in the bioethics literature, including Ray DeVries' new book, which
1034		has just come out, in which I wrote the afterword
1035	McGEE:	It's out?
1036	FOX:	Well, I assume it was one of the things that sparked this discussion in Baltimore
1037		about the fight between the anthropologists and the sociologists. I wrote the
1038		afterword to it and so I read everything in it and it would make your hair stand on
1039		end to read the way that they are using the concept of ethnography. Again, it leads
1040		to the inevitability of anybody who sits down and writes a Richard Selzer-like

1041		story, and they don't even write that well, is supposedly doing a philosophical
1042		narrative. It's not a sociological narrative, it's not an anthropological narrative
1043		because it's not professionally competent. It may be moving, it may be
1044		humanistically admirable, but
1045	McGEE:	The way cases are usedthis is a problem for meit's fine to use cases in the
1046	service	e of argument, but understanding what it is that I do becomes an enormously
1047	import	ant question as I get more and more engaged.
1048	FOX:	The irony of this is that physicians and lawyers should know how to use cases.
1049		They don't use cases just as illustrative anecdotes. Those principles of case
1050		analysis should be applied, shouldn't they, when you're doing more
1051		philosophically oriented work?
1052	McGEE:	Yes, that sounds good.
1053	FOX:	But people don't have training in this, that's what you're saying.
1054	McGEE:	That's right. And I think that has to be taken seriously.
1055	END OF INT	ERVIEW