

Title:

Prostate Cancer - Morality vs. Science

Word Count:

468

Summary:

For illnesses like prostate cancer, morality is on the verge of being sent to the wayside in an effort to allow high risk individuals to be tested for the prostate cancer gene long before they reach the age in which prostate cancer will spring up within their bodies.

Keywords:

Prostate Health Morality, Prostate health Prevention, Prostate Health News, Prostate Helath, Prostate Cancer

Article Body:

With such widespread diseases as prostate and various other forms of cancer, there are concerns which eventually arise about the treatments and tests for such illnesses. Because such illnesses are so prevalent in developed countries, diseases like cancers and diabetes are widely studied by research institutions all over the world in hopes that there will be better cures and quicker tests to determine if someone has the illness or not. However, by developing such treatments, preventative measures and genetic tests, people fall into the problem of what constitutes morality. For illnesses like prostate cancer, morality is on the verge of being sent to the wayside in an effort to allow high risk individuals to be tested for the prostate cancer gene long before they reach the age in which prostate cancer will spring up within their bodies.

Perhaps the biggest debate over prostate cancer morality is whether or not scientists should develop early screening tests for the illness in high risk patients. Due to the extremely high genetic correlation between those affected by prostate cancer and the probability of their children getting the disease when they are older, a genetic test would be an excellent way to help people realize if they will have prostate cancer in the future or not.

Unfortunately for the technologies which could ultimately screen for prostate cancer, morality soon enters the debate. If people find out when they are young that they will have a high risk for prostate cancer at age sixty or so, they may have a slightly traumatic experience growing up and feeling that they will die at around age sixty - especially if there is no cure for prostate cancer by that

time. Furthermore, they would have difficulty finding health insurance - as no self respecting insurance agency will want to insure a person who will be catching a costly disease at age sixty. These are two major concerns from a point of prostate cancer morality.

On the opposite side of the argument, however, people who say that prostate cancer morality should take a back seat to scientific advancement proclaim the benefits of early genetic testing. People should be aware of the status of their health. If more people were to receive blood tests to determine if they are at risk for prostate cancer, they would go get more prostate exams which would in turn lower the mortality rate for prostate cancer. After all, it is pretty difficult for those who support prostate cancer morality to argue against less people dying.

The whole battle between prostate cancer morality and the necessary science to help cure people will certainly turn into a raging debate in the future. Ultimately, the outcome will determine how well we handle other emerging diseases and whether or not we will do whatever it takes to combat them.