SPECIAL PRESENTATION:

"BIOETHICS AND POLITICS: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE."

LUNCHEON DISCUSSION

INTRODUCTIONS:

THE HONORABLE KATHLEEN KENNEDY TOWNSEND, FORMER LT. GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND

FEATURED SPEAKER:

PATRICIA KING, CARMACK WATERHOUSE PROFESSOR OF LAW, MEDICINE, ETHICS, AND PUBLIC POLICY, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

12:30 PM – 1:15 PM
FRIDAY, APRIL 21, 2006

TRANSCRIPT PROVIDED BY
DC TRANSCRIPTION & MEDIA REPURPOSING

MR. JONATHAN MORENO: So I often find myself having to talk over my students for the first 30 seconds or so of a class, so I'm perfectly at home. It's my distinct honor to introduce the individual who will be introducing our luncheon keynote speaker. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, known to all of you, I'm sure, as the former lieutenant governor of Maryland is also the chair of the Institute for Human Virology and on the board of the Center for American Progress.

As somebody who's interested in the history of bioethics, I have to say it's an especially sweet moment for me because, as the lieutenant governor knows, a relative of hers, Sargent Shriver, was instrumental in the creation of the Kennedy Institute of Ethics, which was the second ethics think-tank in bioethics and the first at a university. And Sargent Shriver is also often credited with coining the term "bioethics" in the home of Andre Hellegers, who was the first director of the Kennedy Institute of Ethics, so there's a certain historic completeness to having Lieutenant Governor Townsend with us.

Thank you very much for coming and welcome.

(Applause.)

HON. KATHLEEN KENNEDY TOWNSEND: Thank you. Thanks, Jonathan. And actually I remember being at the opening of the Kennedy School of Ethics many years ago, and I know many of you have gone through it and learned and benefited from it. It's really just a terrific pleasure to be here. When Jonathan asked me to do this a couple of weeks ago, to introduce Professor King, I immediately said yes and felt I was so fortunate to be able to come and listen to the panel this morning and stay for this afternoon, but particularly just to congratulate you and for the Center for putting on such an extraordinary conference and also really focusing on this very, very important issue.

I have to tell you, as lieutenant governor the issue of values is important not just because I learned from Sarge and Eunice – Eunice had a little to do with it; you always have to remember the women – but when I was the lieutenant governor, I started the first character education office that's ever been started in the statewide office, a few others have followed through, because I thought it was very important that we teach kids right from wrong and personal responsibility, and develop a language of ethics because it's too bad that so many kids didn't have that language – they may have the feelings, but without the language it's hard to think about it as you get older.

And obviously at the time that I was lieutenant governor, the biotechnology economy was really growing in Maryland. We had – the genome project was getting off the ground and NIH was doing very well, and we had started the Maryland Technology Development Corporation to start bioethics, so the – biotechnology. So bioethics combines two of my loves and it's so good to be here to see how that conversation is continuing and what we should do about it today. I've also just written a book on

religion and politics in which once again these issues are going to be quite prevalent; not only this current campaign, but I think in referendums all across the country.

When discussing the influence of government on bioethics, there's no one with more experience than our speaker, Professor Patricia King. Professor King is the Carmack Waterhouse professor of law, medicine, ethics, and public policy at Georgetown University. She has been on more federal bioethics commissions than any other living person. She has served on the Department of Health, Education and Welfare Advisory Recombinant DNA Advisory Committee; the President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medical and Biomedical and Behavioral Research; the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research; the Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments; and the ethics, legal and social issues working group of the Human Genome Project.

Of course, Professor King is a member of the Institute of Medicine; a fellow at the Hastings Center; and an adjunct professor at the Department of Health, Policy and Management, the School of Hygiene and Public Health at John Hopkins University. And I have to tell you, her bio goes like this [gestures] and I've just cut this much out of it so you can see she's done a lot. In addition to her extensive work in bioethics, Professor King also finds time to teach at Georgetown University, serve as a member of the American Law Institute, and she was recently appointed a fellow at the Harvard Corporation. She's a board member of the Henry Kaiser Family Foundation and chair of the board of trustees of Wheaton College.

Today, Professor King will be speaking to us about the role of federal commissions in bioethics from her own immense and varied experience, and if we're lucky she'll also talk to us about how she sees the future of bioethics. I hope you'll all join me in welcoming Professor King. We are so lucky to have her and we are so lucky to have her wisdom.

Thank you so much.

(Applause.)

MS. PATRICIA KING: Thank you very much, Kathleen. Like Jonathan, it gives me special pleasure to have you here and to be introduced by you. I certainly started working in bioethics many, many years ago and your family played a critical role in those beginnings. And I, too, have a long-term affiliation with the Kennedy Institute of Ethics which still exists, as well as the Hastings Center. Thank you very much.

After accepting Jonathan's invitation some months ago, I have been really tempted many times to call him up and say that I wouldn't do it. When I told those who know me well that I had been asked to come to the Center for a day-long meeting and to give a talk and it was going to involve progressive bioethics they laughed and they laughed with reason, I think. I don't normally think of myself as being either liberal or

conservative. Other people have views about me either liberal or conservative, progressive or whatever.

I remember when I served with Ruth Faden on the Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments, one of the observers in the audience over a period of time went up to the executive director and said, "That's Roger Wilkins' wife, with those views, making those statements?" For those of you who don't know, my husband is Roger Wilkins and he has his own history and lineage, and he is known as a progressive and sometimes on the left, and he is known for his long involvement in civil rights work, so I'm not even in his shadow. I like to think that I'm my own human being, and I think that's particularly important for women.

Well, I didn't do it, even though I couldn't – call Jonathan, that is – even though I couldn't figure out what I had to say about the past that could be useful or more importantly what the future should be, so I'm going to try with those caveats.

My experience with bioethics began in 1974 when I was asked by a Republican secretary of then HEW if I would like to be a member of this commission that was being newly formed. And I leaped at the chance because many of you know this was the period in which the Tuskegee syphilis experiment had only recently been revealed and questions of human involvement and research were at the forefront and I had a very special interest in this area. So I agreed and I got started and one of those strange happenings of fate into an entirely new field and a new career focus for myself.

So I joined the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects and so my experience – which begins my experience, which is specifically work in the policymaking or, as Dan Callahan referred to it, the regulatory aspects of bioethics. I think this is important because those of us who consider ourselves working in the regulatory policy aspects of bioethics see things – we're all of one group, but how we see our work is different and what we're interested in is to some degree different.

It is important that when I joined the National Commission we were not being asked whether we should do human research, whether we should research on human subjects. We were being asked the questions of what subjects, under what conditions, and what circumstances. Those are different kinds of questions than the question of whether we should do the research in the first place.

My work, therefore, or this introduction, therefore, made me understand early on that bioethics and this policy aspect reflects the society and the culture from which bioethics springs, so I have never seen a division between what I do and the society and the culture in which I live. In fact, some of my earliest beliefs and battles in bioethics had to do with the fact that we were too philosophically inclined, too removed from the real world, and lacked real appreciation for the fact that others saw our issues differently than we did.

So being grounded both in terms of my personal experience and also my particular interests in the society and in its culture, of course I'm not surprised that bioethics would have evolved in the same way that our society and culture has evolved. Along with the society in which we live, over the last almost 40 years we have become more divisive, more ideologically focused, and we have changed to some extent with our times. And the question for us of course today is we do have choices in these matters as a field and the choices are whether we wish to participate in – to continue to participate in, and if so to what extent, in what we all increasingly see as this polarization and divisiveness about basic questions. I'll come back to that if I have time; about how I see where we should go in the future.

How did we get here? I want to make it clear that Jonathan said, "Do a memoir. Focus on what your experiences were," so like Ruth Faden I'm going to make all my declarations up front. I'm not a historian. I'm not a philosopher. I am a lawyer, and I'm not going to pretend that you're getting an analytical account of what I'm about to say. You are going to get very much a personal set of reflections; some reflections that I think may have within them, I hope, important lessons.

I agree with the comment earlier this morning that the very act of creating a public commission is a political act. And so from the very beginning bioethics – the policy side anyway – was very much involved in politics and very much subject to the controversies and the diverse views that we continue to encounter today. The National Commission was the first, as I understand it, not just Bioethics Commission, but the first commission to operate in the public eye in terms of having always to conduct our deliberations in public and only to adjourn for personnel matters and that is, in fact, what we did.

We were created, as some would say, in scandal: the scandals of Tuskegee, Willowbrook, the fetal research, some that are forgotten, psychosurgery, prison research. Those were all the subjects of books, controversy, congressional discussion. Fetal research, which the National Commission was asked to issue a report on and we did, was then and still is a highly controversial and contested area. The commission met just after *Roe* had been decided in 1973 and we were just beginning to think in this country about doing more extensive research on the fetus.

The National Commission did issue a report. It was mostly a unanimous report and someone asked this morning how could we have done that. In retrospect, I think we were able to do it because it was our first report of the first bioethics commission and that had something to do with it. The second point I would make, and this goes to the trajectory: we were in the infancy in this country in thinking that we had something to learn that was important for health, important for human well-being from the fetus. We forget this, that when we talk about stem cell research today, when we talk about embryo research today, when we talk about the merger between stem cell research and genetics and reproductive research, that these in our history are relatively recent.

So we were doing fetal research in the early 1970s and it was certainly enough to be the subject of debate on the floor of the Congress, but it was certainly not the issue with so much at stake for all sides as it was then. But I should say that the National Commission, because it was new, had persons drawn from various perspectives and disciplines. It had pro-life, pro-choice, or persons who had pro-life or pro-choice views, and I must say we learned to talk to each other with respect and to listen over the course of the few months that we were committed to work on a report on fetuses.

In the midst – in case any of you have forgotten – of the indictment of Dr. Kenneth Edelin – I'm dating myself – in Boston in the midst of reports of the indictments of five researchers for conducting research with women who were about to undergo abortion in an effort to learn what drugs crossed the placenta in pregnancy and what drugs did not, because we needed that information or it would have been nice to have that information for women who suffered from illnesses during the course of pregnancy. So I assumed that this was a controversial time and we were to some extent enmeshed in political controversies.

What was different? I think it helped that we were procedurally focused or process focused: that we tried to devise ways of allowing certain research and not other research. We were interested in monitoring and oversight. We were interested in who got to make the decision. Those are questions that are amenable – even though they're still controversial, they're amenable to reaching a loose consensus on how to proceed to the next step. And so while our composition was different, the kinds of questions that we focused on – controversial – children's research was controversial in those days – they still were the kinds of questions that we could take small steps forward on.

It wasn't until I was thinking about today's talk that I went – and going back and looking at some of the materials that I realized how consensus-focused everybody was. The first report, the fetal report, actually spelled out the differences among members of the commission and the deliberations and conclusions section. We don't do that anymore. It actually represented the views of everybody on the commission, and we were a diverse group, in the deliberations and conclusions.

More importantly, when we gave the recommendations, you know we actually gave the votes? When have you seen a bioethics report that's spelled out as a part of what it's doing – until we get to the new national – the Council on Bioethics, so it's – part of this is cycling around – where those differences are spelled out and they're disclosed because we're working on hard issues, and there should not be a party line on those kind of hard issues if you're really struggling with them.

By the time the commission got to its second report on children, we stopped discussing the differences and the deliberation and conclusions. We went to dissents as opposed to the majority and we dropped the practice of spelling out the yeas and the nays on each recommendation. If you read the report, and especially if you weren't careful, then everybody was in agreement. You had to read down to get the dissent and the bottom line.

By the time the Ethics Advisory Board, which was a subsequent body that was recommended by the National Commission, was created, the Ethics Advisory Board took the views of the ethicists in the field with respect to in vitro fertilization. They discussed the views in very descriptive fashion, and then they had their own conclusions without votes and without really telling those of us who read the report how we got from what other ethicists thought to the conclusions that the members of the EAB had been able to reach.

I'd suggest that these were the early signs that consensus was desirable, the early signs that consensus was more likely to be achieved if membership of the commission or group were controlled. These were the early signs of what I call turning inward or closing down. We were moving away from, I think, a more robust discussion of what might be hard issues.

I'm not suggesting that it works very well to have people who can't talk or respect each other trying to discuss a serious issue, but I am trying to suggest that it should be able – that it should be possible without having to have such a narrow frame of difference or different perspectives.

From my point of view, there were two major turning points to a more divisive, more politicized era and I would – for me, these were not partisan political turning points. The EAB worked on in vitro fertilization and issued a report, and it was a Democratic secretary of HEW that let it die without comment. That was the first turning point because we had a commission. We had a panel. It had worked very hard on a contentious issue, and if there had been some reaction or some continued thinking about these issues, then we wouldn't be faced with the current prospect of having reproductive technologies being unregulated and patients exposed – in the interests of trying to achieve fertility exposed to risk.

The second turning point was one I was involved in personally and that was in 1988 when I was a member of the fetal tissue transplantation panel. I have been on too many commissions. It helps to be black and female in an era when there weren't many of us of either description. When the fetal tissue panel was appointed, just before we were to start our work, there was a leak from the White House of a draft of an executive order with respect to fetal tissue and we got off on the foot of saying, why are we doing this, everything has been decided before we start. I remember this experience so very well, because it meant that this was politics. This is big-time politics. I don't think it's new. This was big-time politics as far as I was concerned.

Things were – there were efforts to smooth this over and the panel started its work. The panel's work was carefully structured. We had to respond to questions that were put to us by the assistant secretary of health with respect to fetal tissue use. The panel's initial efforts because the time was so slow – was so tight was to give very short answers to those ten questions, because he felt there was no time for more extensive deliberation. All the while we have been working as a group towards – and crafting

carefully a response to those ten questions. And just as we reached the end of that process, we were given the rather lengthy dissents of three members of the panel who wished to dissent.

Well, all I can say is there was a minor uproar, on the part of some people feelings of betrayal that we had worked in good faith as a group, but we all gathered together and we got over that and we met yet another time to try to issue a more fulsome report, including dissents. But after that, everybody understood, if you hadn't understood before, that bioethics was enmeshed in politics and whenever you served on one of these panels membership was key, so in the Republican administrations they might look one way and Democratic administrations it might look another.

So with respect to what Ruth Faden said this morning, I would add an additional phrase. One of Ruth's hypotheses was the animating issues didn't have a deep, right/left trajectory. I think that that part is – there's a lot to that; that the only – the issues around the fetus had that deep-seated feeling. But I would say that it was before it was identified with partisan political parties because that's what started to close ranks. You had to identify with your own kind which was, at least at a personal level for me, something I've never adjusted to well and so I don't make any pretense of saying I have conformed. But it was, nonetheless – and we're going into the '90s now – it was, nonetheless, those two moments were sort of critical if you were doing the policy side of issues because we knew what happened with issues that were not the subject of political interest and we understood that those that were you couldn't expect to get a lot done.

In the '90s – I really actually won't go through a great deal of this because a lot of this has been covered, but I just want to point to two events that I think had an impact. One was in the late '80s and early '90s, the creation of the Human Genome Project which was a vast, wonderful, scientific step forward, but it certainly had a real impact on bioethics. It became the sources of our livelihoods. The only money game in town and in the country actually was the Human Genome Project. And whoever made – it was Mister – it was Professor Evans, I think, who made the comment about consumerism. I couldn't have agreed with him more. We turned our faces to certain kinds of issues. They certainly needed to be struggled with, but in the process, we also ignored others. But in the process we became wedded to science advancement in ways that I think ultimately made the real issues for the field.

We lost some of our critical stance. Did not mean – and I don't want anybody to misunderstand me. I am a fierce advocate for the advancement of science. I believe in the good that it brings. I believe in all of those things, but I don't have to say those things I don't think. I think what we need to be reminded of is that nothing is wholly good or perfect and that we need to be responsible in the ways we develop and use our science. And that requires some critical reflection; not antagonism, not saying what we can't do, but some critical reflection about what limits are and where limits, if any, are appropriate.

The second thing I think – I'm losing my notes – the second point I would think as a result of this alliance with science that came about in the 1970s, at least by some,

though some have continued to be critics, is that a change started which I actually find personally disconcerting as well as professional disconcerting, and that is that for the first time having long been an advocate of doing stem cell research, doing embryo research with some constraints, to be – to be asked to pass a litmus test – I knew I was in politics then – to pass a litmus test about what my view were specifically before I can engage in a project on stem cell research. Well, from my point of view we have come full cycle. So whether we like it or not, we are totally enmeshed in politics.

I think that there are lots of reasons other than my own personal experiences that I could point to why this has become so, but for me the real question becomes what do we do about it? How do we think about it? I don't believe in dialing back the clocks. That doesn't work in life. So you have to think about where you are and where we would like to go.

I'm glad, Jonathan, you invited me, wherever you are, because I do think and see today as a part of what needs to be done with respect to bioethics, which is some critical reflection about what we do and how we might proceed in the future, and what our role will be, if any. And I've learned a great deal about that just listening this morning, and I think that we need more of it and we need to be more explicit about what the pressures are on this as a field.

As an aside, I would say as a law professor we have exactly the same kinds and similar problems. Do I appear on the bioethics brief that's going to the Supreme Court? Do I sign a Solomon amendment petition on my faculty or not? We all have to make these decisions in our personal lives and in our professional lives, and we have to rethink what role we are playing as a discipline. And the issues here that we discuss have certainly become a part of the law and particularly for professors in law. So that's the first thing.

The second thing is I – and you won't be surprised – is I think it would be healthy while we continue to work on issues involving technology and its implications, if we at the same time recognize that bioethics as a field has been inattentive to the issues of social justice. And my favorite cartoon – and "favorite" is the wrong word – the cartoon that really continues to tug at my heart and is on the door of my office is Tom Toles's cartoon in *The Washington Post* shortly after Katrina where he shows what it looks like with the receding waters. So there are little puddles, there's a dead body, there's debris, and there are labels, "Race," "Class," "Poverty," and "Inequality." And there's Uncle Sam on the bottom right-hand corner saying, "Were these there before?" (Laughter.)

Well, yes, they were there before. They are still there and they should be the subject of political conversation, and they certainly should be, I think, at the heart of what we bioethicists do. A part of what is involved in regaining our footing I think is the focus not only on the latest whatever that's in science, which is important, but just to focus on how what science is doing is translated into the lives of human beings.

And I don't talk about the future when we get to some of the genetic technologies that we know are coming down the road. That's important. I'm talking about the present. I'm talking about the need to involve ourselves in moving away from part of our roots, which is in biomedicine, and to think more carefully about the line that we've always maintained between biomedicine and public health; that a part of our ethical issues, it seems to me, are involved in helping to bring about not just access, but health and well-being.

Many ethical issues are involved in this and to carve ourselves into arbitrary disciplinary lines I think might be unwise. And I think that bioethics has a special – not expertise, but a special interest in some of these questions, because we started as an interdisciplinary field. We didn't quite pull it off in many instances, but we were ahead of the game because we considered ourselves as an interdisciplinary group. And part of what we need, I think, is to continue the root of being interdisciplinary, but work more intensively on some of the issues both here and abroad that deal with inequality and justice. My favorite, of course, being questions of disparities in health and social inequalities in health, but I leave to those of us who are interested to expand that somewhat. What I've had to say about inequality and social justice resonates particularly when we were talking about genetics, but I want to make it clear that not exclusively about when we were talking about genetic technologies.

So reflection, subject matter, process in the sense of the need for interdisciplinary focus. And I should add: interdisciplinary focus is very hard work, that it requires really learning and studying other disciplines to the point where you can really make connections. This is not an easy way to go if one wants to do serious work. And I would add – I've been talking about bioethics because that's what I like. That's what I know and that's what I do. But questions of social injustice are questions for us all. So to the extent that this overlaps with questions of politics and the future areas where people should be working, I'm actually all for it. I don't see a real disconnect, but I think that what I would like to be doing is working on some of the social justice questions from inside.

I'm going to stop, but – I've probably gone way over my time, but when I joined – when I started working on public issues and bioethics, I thought we did something very important when we – the National Commission first made the recommendations about research on human subjects. Nobody wanted that commission. Most of all, researchers didn't want it, lest we forget. We did important work for the science community. We did important work, I think, for the human community, and I would like to turn back to those days. I was very disappointed after the last election when I learned – because I am a registered Democrat – that I didn't have values. (Laughter.) I have values. I think those I work with have values. I think that they are important values. I think that it's time for us to do the work, to express some of the values that inform and animate all of us. My own area for doing that is in the area of social justice, but it is important, whatever your area and however you personally want to work that we send the message that we have values.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. MORENO: We have about ten minutes for comments and questions, so I'll let Professor King field those. Any questions?

MR. : Name and where you're from, please.

Q: I'm J. D. Hanson. I work on genetic issues and bioethic issues for the International Center for Technology Assessment. One of the – I appreciate your raising Katrina and other issues because I do think the bioethics tent has not covered all the areas that it should have.

One of the issues that happened recently, the EPA is looking at what kinds of research it uses to determine how many pesticides we'll expose people to. I don't know. Have you followed that any? And is that an area that we can deal with the human justice and social justice aspects?

MS. KING: Well, I haven't followed closely exposure to pesticides, though I know a little bit about it. And a part of –

MR. HANSON: What they were wanting to do is use old data from exposure to prisoners, data on exposure that children had experienced in other countries as a way of setting U.S. standards. Yeah. So would the –

MS. KING: Well, if –

MR. HANSON: Would the human subjects work – it seems that the human subjects where it hasn't entered quite as much into our environmental exposures as it has our medical exposure.

MS. KING: First, based on the little bit that I know, which actually involves doing work in this country exposing subjects to pesticides, for example, (in the home?) and later EPA scandal, I would venture two comments and definitely off my field – out of my league.

One, when I look at genetics and the – when I think about racial disparities or class disparities and health, I immediately get to the question of environment versus genetics, and so one of the areas that I would like to see us move towards in terms of interdisciplinary approaches is an interaction between environment and genetics. And for those of us who care about race categories and racial disparities in health, this is very important that it's not the genetics alone, but may be environment as well.

The other area in terms of thinking about environment, and I hardly think about at all, but I do think about the fact that we Americans tend to think of globalization as over

there. We're all for it, but it's over there. We are exporting something of ourselves to do some good around the world. I don't quite see it that way. I see it as New Orleans showed us that we have conditions in this country that are as difficult as conditions elsewhere. And questions of environmental exposures, questions of damage to humans are clearly elsewhere in the world a part of a problem, but they're here as well.

So I can only go back to my question – my issue of bioethics had its roots in the life sciences, not just biology. And it may be time to think about returning to those roots in terms of dealing with environmental issues and the problems of human research, but there are lots of others – how we do research on others. The Advisory Commission on Human Radiation Experiments got into this a little bit, but it sort of hasn't been taken up in quite the way that we had hoped, but I think this should be a big future area.

Q: Dr. King, thank you for being with us today. My name is Vale Miller. I'm from Case Western Reserve University and my question for you is you seem to – it just really inspired me – of really going forth with our views of expressing our values about which we're often studying academically. I know a lot – several of the students here are doing a lot of empirical studies and things of that nature, but do you advocate for a lot of the people who are in academia to kind of jump from the pages of academia into advocacy roles or do you think that that's the best way for them to kind of promote those values that we are particularly interested in?

MS. KING: I certainly am interested in the field not becoming an advocacy organization. In other words, I am on that side, I guess, of the spectrum that would say that bioethics shouldn't be anymore involved in politics than it has to be by virtue of what it does in its public side. That's a response to a field.

Individuals have to decide how they're going to do this and this is no different from any other discipline in that respect to the extent that you want to get involved in partisan politics and so I don't think of it as liberal conservative only. It's liberal, conservative, and partisan and we shouldn't forget that. That has to be an individual decision.

I think of it as role playing, and you have to decide every day what role you're in. Are you an academic – and you have to make other people understand this? Are you an academic, are you objective, are you trying to present both sides of the issues, or are you taking a stand? And are you taking a stand on behalf of others? And those are the kinds of questions you have to go through as an individual.

Some people are more comfortable with the whole spectrum; others are not. But as a field my inclination is to be more academic, more objective, more neutral. To the extent anything I work on and make an argument about can be used by others in furtherance of whatever political stance they want to take, I'm undoubtedly happy. It's nice to know one's work has impact somewhere, but as a field I hate to see us get into a progressive bioethics and a conservative bioethics.

MR. MORENO: We're going to have one last question.

Q: I'm Fred Vonkowski from the University of Vienna in Austria; once upon a time from NIH. I'm wondering if you as an attorney or a Harvard governor or whatever role you want to play can tell us any clues as to how to bridge the gap between the folks who say that ethical knowledge comes from revealed religion and the folks who reject that basis for ethical knowledge.

MS. KING: Well, that's a tough one, but I'll have to tell you what I was thinking initially when I heard somebody else raise a similar question. I sat down next to – at dinner about a week ago against a – next to a very wealthy, very economist leader of a hedge fund in New York and I said to myself, I have nothing to say to a person whose life is ruled by the market because our early discussions were all in the name of capitalism, free market, and this conversation was going nowhere I thought.

And it turns out that the person that I was sitting next to after we went through all of that, to my dismay, had a real interest in academic subjects, a real interest in literature, a real interest in thinking about what I call the kind of the hard issues that I like to think about and we ended up having a terrific dinner conversation. Now, that was about as hard for me to get to the point of being able to have a real exchange as it is to talk to somebody who has deep religious beliefs. I guess I belong to that protestant elite that they were talking about by virtue of being an Episcopalian, but I'm a lapsed one at that. That's about as hard for me as talking to someone who has deep religious convictions, and that is you start from different worlds. You start from different premises. And you certainly can't do it standing up at a cocktail party or in some analogous short interaction, but I think that it can be done and I think it can be done not because your mind is going to change or that person's mind is going to change, but because there is something to learn.

And I learned this from a colleague of mine whose work has all been in the history of science, in the philosophy of science, who has a special interest in the great scientists who nonetheless thought that there was something bigger than they were. They might not call it God and they may not call it god of a particular religious denomination as we would, but I was always struck by that: that even those who start with different premises many are willing to understand and acknowledge that there is something bigger than human beings having their own imprimatur on what our society is.

So, yes, if the person is willing to talk to me and engage in a discussion, I'm willing to talk to them and to find out more about what animates them. And you should know, I was a religion major in college. (Laughter.)

(Applause.)

MR. MORENO: Thank you, Pat. We will adjourn for 15 minutes and reassemble at 1:45 for the afternoon panel.

Thank you. And if we could get the afternoon panel to come up to the front to meet the moderator, that would be a good thing.

(END)