1. Athletes have long used various enhancements to gain a competitive edge. Is using a genetic enhancement any different?

- Yes [41%]
- No [40%]
- Unsure [13%]

2. If genetic enhancements are offered to some elite athletes, should they be made available to all?

- Yes [68%]
- No [15%]
- Unsure [11%]

3. Would you enhance your athletic performance by altering your genes, if at the time the process was undetectable and safe?

- Yes [16%]
- No [65%]
- Unsure [18%]

4. If you had the chance to use genetic technology to enhance the competitive ability of your child, would you take it?

- Yes [21%]
- No [69%]
- Unsure [18%]

The responses to questions 2-4 above depart significantly from .50-.50, while those for question 1 do not. It seems to me that question 1 is essentially a question about factual knowledge about characteristics unique to genetic enhancement. There’s nothing in question 1 to attach values to. Questions 2-4, on the other hand, can be answered on the basis of clear values.

Question 2 seems to relate to the value of distributional justice. Question 3 relates to any of a variety of values: fairness in competition, respect for “Nature’s Way,” risk aversion, among many others about which we can only guess. Question 4 seems to differ from question 3 only in that it includes a child. In that regard, it is interesting to note that there’s virtually no difference in the distributions of the responses to questions 3 and 4. Apparently, this group of 150 respondents is not taking seriously the child as a unique stakeholder.
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