

Mary Alice Yeskey

Welcome to the Hopkins Press Podcast. I'm Mary Alice Yeskey with the Hopkins Press Journals Division. Our guest today is Elizabeth Lanphier, a faculty member in the Ethics Center and in the Division of General and Community Pediatrics at Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center. She is a philosopher and bioethicist affiliated faculty in the University of Cincinnati Departments of Pediatrics, Philosophy, and Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, as well as the Center for Public Engagement with Science, and is a non-resident fellow with the George Mason Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy.

She is guest editor, along with Larry Churchill, of the latest issue of *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, a special issue titled "Translational Work of Bioethics." She joins us today to talk about how the issue came about and what important work the field of bioethics is doing today.

Thank you so much for joining us today, Elizabeth. I really appreciate your time to talk about this exciting issue.

Elizabeth Lanphier

I'm really glad to be here and excited to talk about it with you.

Mary Alice Yeskey

The first question I'd like to ask all our guests is what is your academic origin story? What led you to the study of bioethics?

Elizabeth Lanphier

Well, I can pretty safely say that I never set out initially to study bioethics, and I definitely got here in a very meandering way. So, I'll try to give you the briefest answer possible. But, I sometimes think that having a sense of the idiosyncratic paths people take into academia and some of the twists and turns can be helpful to hear about, especially for folks maybe considering an academic career, if that's among your listeners.

I will say for me, a lot of this came about through a pretty healthy dose of chance and good fortune. So like, when I went to college, bioethics was not on my radar. In my very first semester of college, I took an Intro to Ethics course. And in hindsight of knowing the things I

know about philosophy as a discipline now, I'm really not surprised that I didn't stick with it. Women remain a pretty notable minority among philosophy majors, philosophy PhDs, and philosophy professors. So I ended up being drawn into literature and studied English and French literature, studied post-colonial literature and history in both languages. That led me into ending up in the nonprofit sector and the global health NGO sector. I got an internship at Doctors Without Borders—

Mary Alice Yeskey

Oh, interesting.

Elizabeth Lanphier

Yeah, my senior year in college, and it turned into a job that turned into another job that turned into some training on the job. And that was really because I was fluent in French, and I was interested in nonprofit work. And that really got me kind of on the track to think about health and health ethics and health equity. And I eventually found the program in narrative medicine at Columbia University. Narrative medicine is a field pioneered by Rita Sharon, and I really thought, well, this is like an interesting mix of my interest in literature and health. And so I enrolled part-time in their degree program.

And there I discovered I loved poetry, and I loved the philosophy classes I was taking with a philosopher named Craig Irvine, who runs their philosophy curriculum in that program. And so when I was at the point of thinking about life path juncture, I said, well, I'm either going to go do an MFA in poetry or I'm going to go do a PhD in philosophy. Those were the two things that—

Mary Alice Yeskey

(laughter) So closely related.

Elizabeth Lanphier

Right. And frankly, some of it came down to: well, a PhD in philosophy is going to take a lot longer, so let me see if I can get into any of those programs first. And then, you know, not to say an MFA in poetry is a backup plan, but it was like—it will, I'll be able to get that done a little faster. So, that's what I did. And I applied to PhD programs in philosophy. I give so much credit to Craig Irvine and some of my other mentors at the Columbia program who who backed me on this, despite having no real formal training in philosophy going in.

And I'll just say that once—so I ended up doing my doctoral work at Vanderbilt in the philosophy department and knew I was going to do something at the intersection of philosophy and health care experience. I had a hunch I'd figured out along the way. And actually it was

poetry that got me introduced to some folks at the Center for Biomedical Ethics on the medical campus at Vanderbilt, because I met some poet physicians at a conference.

Mary Alice Yeskey

I love this story. (laughter)

Elizabeth Lanphier

Yeah! And they—you know, it was like two poets and anesthesiologists, and they said, oh, you need to meet these folks at the Center for Biomedical Ethics. So that's how I actually met Larry Churchill and Joe Manning and folks who became my mentors at Vanderbilt on the clinical ethics side of things. And when I met Larry, who's my co-editor on this special issue, who became a mentor to me over the years, I said, well, now that I see your career as a scholar and philosopher and ethicist and a clinical ethicist doing that practical work in the hospital setting, that's what I want to do. How can I get there?

And Larry very generously, as he is, took me in kind of under his wing as a mentee and helped me set out on this path and connect me to some people that I've continued to work with and train with since. So, that was my origin story. Like I said, a little circuitous, but actually Larry Churchill was very fundamental to it. So, I'm very excited that we got to work on this special issue together.

Mary Alice Yeskey

That's wonderful. That's precisely why I asked the question, because I know at least for me—especially when I was much younger, like an undergrad—have this sense that there's this linear step to get to this thing that you think you want to do. And it never works out that way. It's always just sort of hopscotching around and figuring it out. And then much like when you met Larry, sometimes you just meet this person. You're like, oh, wait a minute. I didn't even know you could do that. And I just, yeah, I love finding out the ways people sort of take these meandering roads because that's really—every time I ask this question, it's the same answer. It's like, well, and then I did this and that's precisely what I'm trying to get folks, especially young scholars to know is that it's okay.

Elizabeth Lanphier

It's okay. And I think in some ways it's more interesting. I'm sure there's people who do know early on exactly what they want to do and they're very driven and they get there and that's also amazing.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Nothing wrong with that.

Elizabeth Lanphier

Nothing wrong with that. I like really commend those folks because you get probably where you're going a lot faster than us. But I think there's a lot of learning along the way and you get to bring all of these different experiences to the table and that can be really exciting and create innovation that you couldn't have found otherwise, I think. And so, yeah, that's my meandering idiosyncratic origin story, though I don't think it's idiosyncratic in the sense that I think you're right. A lot of people can learn from kind of being open to different pathways and not expecting it to be at all linear.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Right, and not being harsh on yourself if you think something doesn't necessarily line up with the correct or assumed path. In hindsight, it will. In hindsight, you'll be like, oh, this might've been a strange little one-off, but I learned XYZ. You know what I mean? I feel that so strongly that there's no wasted experience.

So you mentioned Larry Churchill, which leads me to my next question, which is that both of you are guest editors for this issue of *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, which is what we're here to talk about today. The title of the special issue is "Translational Work of Bioethics." So I'd like to know how the issue came about and how you guys came to be guest editors.

Elizabeth Lanphier

It really started out as a conversation between me and Larry, primarily over email initially. And Larry and David Shank, who had published an article in 2021 in *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* called "Ethical Maxims for a Marginally Inhabitable Planet," and in that essay, they posit six maxims learned from their work in clinical ethics that they argue can and should really extend to how bioethicists address climate change, right? This kind of mass catastrophe that is upon us of climate change. And they had shared it with me with a note about how they wrote it really with this next generation of bioethicists in mind. And I guess they included me in that next generation of bioethicists, and I responded with a bunch of questions and thoughts.

I was really interested in their article, and I kept coming around to this question of, but exactly how are we—meaning bioethicists—supposed to be living and thinking these maxims? Like they still felt a little bit theoretical to me, even though they were maxims really set out to help us figure out how to be, how to live, how to act. And I was like, but I'm not sure exactly how to do that within our field, right? And the norms of our field and the constraints of a field and what does that really look like? And so I was just sort of riffing on some questions and what practically, tangibly could we be doing and should we be doing to make an impact? And we had a back-and-forth conversation about this.

I think in clinical ethics, which really is involved directly in patient care, some of that impact is much more direct and immediate than thinking about how to—so it makes sense to me that that's where they were starting from, was clinical ethics practice that has this tangible, practical implementation aspect. But I was really puzzled a little bit about, like, how we translate some of that to something that feels maybe bigger, more abstract, like climate change, environmental health. So I really appreciated their point that the lessons learned from clinical ethics could be extended to other practice-based realms like climate change, but I was trying to figure out how that should look, right?

And I thought, you know, it's not only about climate change, it's about anti-racism and healthcare, it's about equitable healthcare policy-making. And so it just really raised a lot of additional questions for me.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Right. Just kind of rippled out.

Elizabeth Lanphier

Yeah. I'm excited by this, but I want to think more about it. I don't really know where to go with it. And in response, as I'm raising all these questions, Larry proposed, we put together a call for papers for the symposium, really to invite a range of responses from creative thinkers in the field to try to get us, you know, to start thinking about and answering these questions. How are they thinking about it? Right? What are people doing that speaks to this practical, tangible approach to really what we might see as, you know, contemporary healthcare crises, again, related to climate change, related to pandemics like COVID-19, related to structural inequities and, you know, what are people doing? What might they aspire to be doing? What can we learn from our colleagues in the field? Let's put a call out and see what they have to say. So that's really how it started.

Mary Alice Yeskey

That's so—I love that. It's just, it's so kind of organic, just like the questioning. And then it just kind of got, the ripples got bigger and bigger and bigger. So you put out a call for papers, and I did notice in your introduction that you noted that you limited the submissions to 3000 words. And I was curious what your reasoning was for that decision.

Elizabeth Lanphier

Yeah. So this was a tough call because we were asking people to do incredibly innovative and impactful work and giving them a relatively short space to do it in. So, we understood that we were asking for something that was going to be challenging. Sometimes, it's easier to write

something longer and figure out how to develop those ideas than it is to make the concise, brief impactful point. Ultimately, the decision was based on the fact that we wanted to have a really wide range of ideas and authors, and we wanted the space to do that. So, keeping the submissions shorter or on the shorter side allowed us to include more voices and more views. And that was really important to us.

I think our mission with the symposium is also to be a catalyst for ideas, both for the issue's authors as well as its readers. So we're hoping, and we fully hope that some authors maybe who started to noodle on a new idea, based on the call for papers or the invitation to submit a paper, will continue to work on these ideas and extend them into longer essays, longer works. We also hope that readers might pick up on some of the ideas that they encounter in the essays and take them into their own directions and their own work and expand on them. So we sort of see this as, again, this spark that's going to get something going rather than necessarily a completed set of ideas that is settled, right? It's about starting a conversation. And I think a lot of this is about understanding this project as, again, like I want to use the word catalyst, spark.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Right. But it's almost like a launchpad for innovative thinking about the issue.

Elizabeth Lanphier

Exactly. That's so well put. And I hope it also makes it accessible to readers who might be able to get a taste of ideas that aren't necessarily within their wheelhouse or the kind of thing they would normally read, but if you're going to flip through the whole issue, a quick 3000 word essay on a topic you might not have typically been exposed to might be a great introduction to it.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Right. And not so intimidating that you're like, "Oh, I can't, this isn't my discipline, I'm not even going to be able to follow this." And they're all written so succinctly because of that request that it makes it very accessible. Having read them, I would say so for sure.

Elizabeth Lanphier

Yes. And someone who's written for it is an expert in what they're writing on, but it's not highly technical writing, and it's not necessarily writing that's assuming other experts are your audience.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Right. Right.

Elizabeth Lanphier

So it's really about, again, I think making it possible to have more interaction between authors and readers and interaction between disciplines and ideas and making that all very accessible.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Yeah. That's one of the things generally I think *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* does really well just as a journal is that I don't—if you had said to me 10 years ago, here's this journal, I would have looked at the title and been like, oh boy, this is not something I know anything about. But I mean, all of the writing has consistently been so accessible and so not bogged down in terms of technical or scientific speech that you don't understand what's being said. And this issue is no exception for sure.

Elizabeth Lanphier

That's a good point. I hadn't really thought about how the title of the journal might give it a sense of being highly—

Mary Alice Yeskey

(laughter) I'm not criticizing the title per se, but I'm just saying, I would not have known if I didn't know, dive in that it's all very accessible and not super heavy quantitative STEM studies.

Elizabeth Lanphier

A hundred percent. I mean, as a philosopher and bioethicist that I publish in a journal called *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* is now a little bit comical to me, (laughter) but I think one of the most interdisciplinary and accessible journals that kind of takes on healthcare and health sciences from this really humanistic standpoint. And so I think that's—it's a great journal to have in the field.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Next question in terms of the—you put out the call for papers and then as you put the issue together, what surprised you most in that process, either in terms of when the papers started coming in or as you were really editing them and compiling them?

Elizabeth Lanphier

Yeah, I think that we had a call for papers. So there was the call and then we also reached out to some folks kind of individually and let them know about the call, and we're really excited to potentially hear from them. And it was a little bit, I don't know if I want to say it's surprising how many people were really game for writing on this topic because I think that we in some

ways anticipated that, but it was exciting to see, so I'll maybe say that it's been exciting more than a surprising finding in this experience. You know, in terms of a surprising thing, one thing as I was really getting into the essays and reading them as a group, really, you know, kind of one after the other was how much the essays seemed to speak to each other, despite being on very different topics and by scholars with very different disciplinary and personal backgrounds, but I felt like they already were in conversation with each other quite often. And it wasn't that difficult as editors then to kind of create that through line of how they were—how they fit together topically or, you know, building on one another.

So, I think it was easy for us to kind of group them in terms of the topics that they fell under, so narratives in bioethics, justice work, institutional and, you know, public policy making, bioethics and social sciences, climate and environment, like they all sort of naturally fell into these collections, which was helpful. And then I, as an editor, had the benefit of writing the essay that I ended up writing for the symposium a little like concurrent with the editing process. I had some of these essays that other people had written in my head while I was also drafting my own. And I kept finding connections to the other essays. And so I was really excited to be able to make them and cite to our own authors—

Mary Alice Yeskey

Oh, yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

Elizabeth Lanphier

—in the symposium. And I, you know, kept finding things. Bruce Jennings and his contribution on civic place making kept coming up in what I was writing. Stephen Gardner's work and on a moral perfect moral storm kept coming up in my own writing, and a few other folks, and like I kept hearing these refrains from the authors and that was, I think, surprising, but also exciting.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Yeah. No, I love that. It's kind of like you're baking in the conversation as you write almost. Was there anything that was really challenging for you putting together the issue as a guest editor?

Elizabeth Lanphier

So, this was my first time doing, you know, performing an editorial function. And I have to say that it was incredibly smooth (laughter) from my perspective, working with the *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* team was great, really, really appreciated the journal's editors and copy editors and so joyful to work with them. Everyone at Johns Hopkins University Press has been a delight to work with. And it's really been fun to have an excuse to have a regular conversation with Larry about work and ideas. So, it's been a really positive experience.

But since you asked for a challenge, I will say that one thing that emerged for us as we were putting this together was that we were thinking about this project as translating bioethics scholarship beyond academic journals and into public policy practice forums. And it started to become, I guess, a little ironic that we were doing this in an academic journal. So, that became a little bit of a puzzle for us, like, okay, so it's great we're doing this, and everyone is writing about these kind of translational issues, but we're still doing this really in a setting that is largely going to be accessed by other academics who are probably already used to reading academic journals. So, we addressed it by pitching a virtual speaker series that would put some of the symposium authors in conversation with each other, but also potentially with a broader public audience. That was really our goal, was how do we reach folks who are an interested public who might not typically read academic scholarship?

And so, we have the really good fortune to have had the backing of Hopkins and the journal and to find a partner in the Hastings Center who is helping us host what we're calling the "Bioethics with Bigger Impact" series. And we have some other partner institutions that are co-sponsoring it, including the Center for Public Engagement with Science at University of Cincinnati and the Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy at George Mason. So, really excited about this. We had our first event in November, and it was on bioethics communication, and it included symposium authors, Tia Powell and Travis Reider, who had written with some of his colleagues at the Berman Institute, along with Keisha Ray, who moderated and was able to contribute her own experience in this domain with bioethics communication. It was great. You can find it on the Center for Public Engagement with Science YouTube page and at the Hastings Center websites, it's recorded. The next event is in February, it's on February 7th and it's on transformative justice and social determinants of health, and it's with Gina Campelia, Holly Ho and Gail Henderson. And Jen James is going to moderate and also contribute her experience as a sociologist and bioethicist.

Mary Alice Yeskey

So, are there additional symposiums scheduled out beyond February?

Elizabeth Lanphier

Yes. There's going to be a session in the spring—date to be determined—that will feature some of our authors on climate change and the environment and hoping to do that around Earth Day, perhaps in the spring. So again, these are going to be recorded sessions so people who are listening to this—whenever you're listening to it, definitely check out the "Bioethics with Bigger Impact" events on the YouTube page of the UC Center for Public Engagement with Science or go to the Hastings Center website and you can find them.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Yeah. And we'll link them in the show description also. So it'll all be there so folks can easily click through regardless of when, like you said—if you're listening to this much later, it'll still be there.

Excellent. That's so exciting. And that's such a great—I really enjoy—and I guess this is just sort of the communications professional in me speaking, but I love when something has multiple mediums like that. So, you can sort of take it in in different ways and ruminate on the essays and then go and listen to people actually having engaging conversations about it. I think that really helps broaden your sphere of thinking, and exactly like you said, get you out of that little sort of I'm reading an academic paper box and how does this apply in real life, like boots to the ground, like outside world. So, that sounds fantastic, and I can't wait to listen to the next one.

Elizabeth Lanphier

Great. Thank you. Yeah. I mean, I think I agree with you. Again, I think it also extends that sort of we limited the authors to 3000 words, but here's this opportunity to potentially think a little bit beyond maybe what they'd written about in their papers, to be in conversation with others that might inspire new thinking and collaboration and to sort of see what people who are receiving these ideas, how they react in real time through the Q&A, right? You get immediate feedback in a way that takes a lot longer when you're publishing an academia (laughter) where you wait for someone to cite your essay and have either a critique of it or build on it. And this is really this real time interaction and feedback and it's, I think, a really exciting way to engage with the ideas and with each other and build some community.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Yeah. I mean, much like the conversation started between you and Larry, you know what I mean? It was just sort of a quick bounce back on an email. It takes that to like a bigger, more public sphere. I love that. So, what are you hoping readers take away from this issue, from the special issue?

Elizabeth Lanphier

Yeah, that's a big question, right? Like part of me wants to say, I hope they take away whatever they came to the issue looking for, and that's a cop-out maybe, but I think that so many folks who work in bioethics or adjacent to bioethics or are interested in these topics and would find themselves reading this journal or this special issue are interested in making a bigger impact. They are interested in doing public facing or policy work. They're interested in thinking about how to connect beyond their field. I think bioethics, by definition, has always been an

interdisciplinary space. And I think that there's always more bridges to build and new bridges to build.

And so I anticipate readers are going to come to this issue potentially looking for that, right, and eager to see how colleagues are doing and thinking about this kind of work, this kind of translational work, what successes they've had. I think some of our authors really report on, like Tia Powell, right, report on successes they've had at doing some of this kind of translational work. I think other folks, you know, again, the folks at the Berman Institute are talking about some ways they've created new fora for bioethics communication that are out there. Some of the folks from Baylor University have reported on some successes being embedded in social science work and with bioethics.

I think that there's a lot to learn based on some of the models of what people have described in these essays. I think there's also some aspirational work that is being put out there in terms of people who've been in the field for a while and can see some directions they want to nudge it in based on their experiences. And I think that Gail Henderson does this. I think that Lisa Parker's essay does this. I think that, again, I think that both Howard Brody and Arthur Frank writing about their kind of narrative approaches and insights in bioethics are nudging in some really important directions. John Lynch makes a great call for helping bioethics reframe some of its fundamental stories in ways that I think are incredibly important.

So, I think there's so much to learn and it's going to a little bit depend on what your research interests are, what your practice interests are, but I think there are a lot of things for readers to take away depending on their goals. I think some things readers might take away from the "Bioethics with Bigger Impact" series as well are just like the variety of ways in which bioethics and bioethicists can be leaders on institutional or local, maybe even national and international levels. And I think to encourage readers and viewers and listeners to think creatively about how bioethics interfaces with social justice, racial justice, climate justice, understanding how things like climate change or social determinants of health are part of understanding and perhaps re-envisioning health and healthcare practices. I think all of this is there to be discovered in the issue. Maybe that sounds lofty, but I think it is.

Mary Alice Yeskey

But I think that just, I mean, looking at the titles of all the individual papers, you can see how wide this net is. You know what I mean? And it's not as cliché to say there really is something in there for everybody.

Elizabeth Lanphier

And I don't think—I don't want to pretend that an essay in a journal is going to solve any of these problems. I really—we, Larry and I see this very much again, as this starting and continuing of a conversation that we had started to have with each other, that we have with other colleagues in the field that Larry's had over many decades of being involved with bioethics. And I'm starting to have at a more junior level in my career, right? And so I think it's really kind of seeing it as this, like, ongoing conversation.

And we really hope that readers will appreciate the breadth of innovation going on in bioethics by both established and emerging scholars. I think that the symposium showed how much the translational work of bioethics is a core component of the field since its inception. And at the same time is something that needs to be continually reinvigorated and enacted in the present and future, right? We can't be static about it. And so I hope that readers get inspired to engage in translational bioethics in whatever ways fit their own interests and goals.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Absolutely. Absolutely. And I think that the content of the journal does just that. So looking forward, what are you working on now, research wise, are there any books or papers coming up that you'd like to share with us?

Elizabeth Lanphier

Thanks for asking this question (laughter). So, a lot of my work right now is focused on trauma-informed care, as well as narrative practices. So, some of it builds on work I've published with Dr. Uchenna Anani, who is a neonatologist and bioethicist at Vanderbilt University Medical Center, who I met during my training and when she was a fellow, and now we've continued to partner on projects related to trauma-informed ethics consultation. And that continues to be sort of a portfolio of scholarship for me and research. And then some of my research is also building on a paper I published last year in *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* on narrative and medicine, where I'm really thinking through what I call the premises, practices and pragmatism of narrative in medicine.

And so actually, something I'm currently working on is kind of combining these two things and thinking a little bit more about narrative medicine practices and trauma-informed care and conversation with each other. So, that's an ongoing to-be-continued project. But, I would also say I'm particularly excited to develop some of the ideas I introduced in my symposium essay, which was about bioethics education for legislators. And it was really inspired by how abortion access is now in the hands of state jurisdictions since the Dobbs Supreme Court decision this past summer 2022.

If any listeners do bioethics or other forms of education for legislators and policymakers and want to collaborate on something, I hope they reach out to me because it's really something that I am excited to noodle on and need to identify, I think, collaborators and partners who bring different experiences and expertises to the table. So, that's something that's on the horizon for me. And then I will also just say that I'm particularly excited about a forthcoming book chapter that's coming out this spring, and a volume that's called "Ohio Under COVID." And it was edited by colleagues at the University of Cincinnati, and for this book, I wrote a co-wrote a chapter on Ohio's response to the COVID pandemic and its prisons and jails. I wrote it with a co-author who had been incarcerated in Ohio during the start of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020.

And when I think about, sort of, these themes of "Bioethics with Bigger Impact," doing translational work, etc., this is a collaboration I'm actually really, really proud of, because I met my co-author, funny enough, via social media. And he reached out to me after I'd written some op-eds that I'd written about COVID vaccine access for incarcerated folks in Ohio.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Oh, how interesting.

Elizabeth Lanphier

Yeah, and I'd been, sort of, doing a bioethical analysis of why incarcerated individuals should have some priority for vaccine access when vaccines are rolling out.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Yeah, there's a whole lot of people in a small space. (laughter)

Elizabeth Lanphier

Exactly. Vulnerable populations, constitutional protected right to health care. And at the time, vaccines were still quite scarce. And as we know, there was, you know, a phased rollout. So, I've been doing some writing about this and had a few pieces published in Ohio newspapers and shared them on social media, and my co-author, Forrest, found me on social media.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Oh, I love this story!

Elizabeth Lanphier

Yeah, I also love this story. And it was so fun. We met, we chatted. I was like, "Hey, I'm supposed to write this book chapter, but I kind of think we should write it together." And he

was game, and the editors were game, which I'm really grateful for. So it ended up being a combination, like, research essay where we really dug into some data about COVID and the carceral population here in Ohio, mixed with some conceptual analysis around the ways health care access and rights were and were not being construed in this setting, mixed with Forrest's own experience and some narrative about what he, from a first person perspective, experienced while being incarcerated during the pandemic.

So, super exciting work that involves, like I said, empirical conceptual analysis and this personal reflection. I think it can show how to make a tangible impact, hopefully, on how people understand health care in carceral contexts. I know, you know, the e-book version of the entire "Ohio Under COVID" volume is going to be open access. So, I hope that folks who maybe have an interest in this can find it and check it out and check out some of the other great essays there as well.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Oh, I can't wait to read that. That's really, I mean, moments—stories like that give me a little bit more hope about social media. Do you know what I mean? Because like you get sort of docked down and you get sort of like, oh, this is just garbage and so much negativity. And then something like that happens where there's just these two people connecting to do something really just innovative and different and exciting and that will shed so much light to so many people. I just, I think that's the magic of social media and that really, that excites me. I can't wait to read that.

Elizabeth Lanphier

Yeah. I very reluctantly joined Twitter in 2020 and—or maybe it was 2021, I guess. I'm a pretty recent Twitter joiner, and this was one of the very first things that happened to me on Twitter was making this connection with Forest. And I was like, okay, I see the value, I'm going to stick it out. We'll see how long that lasts. I've actually met another collaborator on Twitter since then, and we've written together and we're going to continue writing together. So, I think that it's just, you know, exciting to see, think about different ways to engage community and make community and, you know, both of those instances are writing with people who are now academically situated, but come from, you know, non-academic backgrounds or not internal to academia in the same way. And I think that that's also really exciting to think about.

Mary Alice Yeskey

Yeah. And I think it also, it speaks to your original point, which is about how much this issue in particular, you know, can make people aware that, you know, bioethics might, precisely like, you know, biology and medicine, bioethics might sound like something that's like, oh, it's

headly. And that's not something that I can really, that really defects my life. But especially now, you know, in year three and a half of COVID, I think that everyone can understand how these conversations affect your life. Maybe not immediately right now on your Friday morning, but in the grand picture they do and they will.

Elizabeth Lanphier

Yeah. One thing I often said, like one, not to be too cavalier about it, but with the pandemic has made it so that I no longer get questions about why a philosopher would work at a hospital.

Mary Alice Yeskey

(laughter) Right. Silver linings. Silver linings.

Elizabeth Lanphier

Yeah. I'm sure, right. People are starting to see why there are these, you know, ethical questions in healthcare and health practices that are, you know, coming up constantly.

Mary Alice Yeskey

I do. I have a running list of COVID silver linings. And so that's another, that's another good one. So I keep it—thank you for adding to my list. And this has been such a delightful conversation. And I will put links to the symposium and all of those wonderful talks that you had mentioned in the show, right up for our listeners. But again, thank you so much for your time. This has been a great conversation.

Elizabeth Lanphier

This has been so much fun. Thanks for your interest.

Mary Alice Yeskey

This podcast is a production of Hopkins Press. For more information, please visit press.jhu.edu.