Perspective

Medicine

No Cure for Something Indicates We Are Still Too Young

Min-Jun Kim*

Seoul National University, 1 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul 08826, Korea
*: All correspondence should be sent to: Dr. Min-Jun Kim.
Author's Contact: Dr. Min-Jun Kim, MD, PhD, E-mail: minjun_kim@snu.ac.kr
DOI: https://doi.org/10.15354/si.26.pe144
Funding: No funding source declared.
COI: The author declares no competing interest.
AI Declaration: The author affirms that artificial intelligence did not contribute to the process of preparing the work.

The persistence of diseases for which no cure exists underscores both the limitations of current medical science and the broader developmental stage of humanity's understanding of biology. Conditions such as Alzheimer's disease, certain cancers, autoimmune disorders, and rare genetic syndromes remind us that despite technological advancements, we remain in the infancy of comprehending complex biological systems. The absence of cures is not merely a scientific challenge but also a philosophical reflection on human maturity, patience, and humility. This article argues that recognizing our current limitations should inspire renewed investment in basic science, interdisciplinary research, and ethical innovation rather than despair. By acknowledging that the lack of cures signals both our scientific youth and the complexity of life, society can adopt a more measured and aspirational approach to medical progress. In doing so, we not only improve the prospects for future cures but also cultivate a more informed, resilient, and thoughtful scientific culture.

Keywords: Medical Progress; Incurable Diseases; Human Development; Scientific Maturity; Biomedical Research

Science Insights, February 28, 2026; Vol. 48, No. 2, pp.2141-2144.

THE PACE of scientific discovery has historically been constrained by human limitations in data processing, experimental design, and hypothesis testing. While technology has consistently expanded our capacity to investigate complex systems, the emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) represents a fundamental shift in how knowledge is generated (Baker et al., 2018). Unlike traditional computational tools that simply process data according to predefined rules, AI can identify patterns, make predictions, and even suggest novel hypotheses autonomously. This capability has the potential to accelerate research across fields, enabling scientists to address pressing global challenges more rapidly and effectively (Vamathevan et al., 2019). By automating labor-intensive tasks and augmenting human intuition, AI is transforming the landscape of scientific

inquiry, creating opportunities that were previously unimaginable.

Throughout history, humanity has sought to overcome the limitations imposed by nature, yet some diseases stubbornly resist our efforts, revealing the immaturity of our scientific and technological capabilities. The fact that certain conditions remain incurable—despite decades or even centuries of study—serves as a humbling reminder that we are still in the early stages of understanding the intricate workings of life. Chronic neurodegenerative disorders, autoimmune diseases, aggressive cancers, and rare genetic syndromes exemplify the areas in which human ingenuity has yet to translate knowledge into definitive cures (Fischer et al., 2025). The persistence of these diseases is not a failure but an indication that the biological systems we seek to influence are extraordinarily complex, and that our methods, though advanced, are still nascent relative to the challenges posed.

Consider Alzheimer's disease, a condition that affects millions worldwide and yet has eluded curative intervention. Decades of research have illuminated key pathological processes—amyloid beta accumulation, tau protein tangles, and neuroinflammation—but therapeutic breakthroughs have been largely incremental and, in many cases, insufficient to alter the disease trajectory meaningfully (Alzheimer's studies show complexity of pathogenesis; Turner et al., 2025). The persistence of Alzheimer's underscores that we are still "young" in our understanding of the brain, a system whose interconnections and regulatory mechanisms defy simplistic intervention. Similarly, autoimmune diseases such as systemic lupus erythematosus or type 1 diabetes demonstrate that even when the immune system is partially understood, modulating its activity without unintended consequences remains a formidable challenge, and no definitive cures exist (Michels et al., 2025; Ebrahimpour et al., 2025). These examples highlight the infancy of our ability to fully manipulate complex, adaptive biological networks.

The absence of cures also reflects the limitations inherent in scientific methodology. Reductionist approaches, while powerful, often fail to capture the emergent properties of living systems. Organisms are not merely sums of their parts; cellular interactions, systemic feedback loops, and environmental influences create layers of complexity that resist linear intervention. In essence, the lack of a cure signals that we are still developing the conceptual frameworks, tools, and technologies necessary to intervene effectively. Our "youth" is not measured chronologically but in terms of the sophistication and breadth of our understanding relative to the intricacy of life (Fischer et al., 2025).

Furthermore, the persistence of incurable conditions highlights the iterative nature of scientific progress. Each failure, each partially effective therapy, and each dead end discovery contributes to a growing body of knowledge that will ultimately support future breakthroughs. The history of medicine is replete with examples of early failures that preceded transformative success. Penicillin, insulin therapy, and vaccines were all preceded by decades of incomplete understanding and trial and error experimentation. In this light, the lack of cures today is analogous to the early stages of scientific adolescence: a period marked by curiosity, incremental gains, and the recognition that mastery requires time and sustained effort.

Another dimension of this observation concerns the ethical and social responsibilities of scientific youth. Being "too young" in understanding implies that interventions must be approached with caution, humility, and a recognition of unintended consequences. Rapid attempts to manipulate biological systems without sufficient understanding can lead to harm, as seen in past medical misadventures such as early gene therapy setbacks or the unforeseen effects of certain pharmaceuticals. The acknowledgment of our developmental stage encourages a balance between ambition and prudence, fostering research practices that are both innovative and responsible.

In addition, the lack of cures exposes gaps in our infrastructure for knowledge generation. Scientific youth is reflected not only in our comprehension but also in the organization of research, funding priorities, and collaborative networks. Many incurable diseases are understudied due to their rarity, social stigma, or the complexity of experimental models. Addressing these structural limitations is part of growing up scientifically: investing in high risk, high reward research, encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration, and developing novel models that more accurately reflect human physiology (Alyass et al., 2015). Such measures accelerate the maturation of the scientific enterprise, bringing us closer to the ability to develop cures.

Technological maturity is another critical factor. Certain biological challenges require tools that are only now emerging. CRISPR gene editing, advanced imaging, single cell sequencing, and AI driven drug discovery exemplifies innovations that expand our capacity to understand and intervene in complex systems (Menon et al., 2025). The fact that cures remain elusive partly reflects that we are in a transitional stage: our technological capabilities are evolving, but not yet sufficient to fully address the intricacies of disease (Fischer et al., 2025). In this sense, the lack of cures serves as a benchmark, reminding us that our tools must grow alongside our understanding.

Cultural and psychological dimensions also shape the perception of incurable diseases. Society often equates medical maturity with the elimination of suffering, yet this perspective overlooks the reality that knowledge, skill, and resources are cumulative and generational. The recognition that we are still "young" in our scientific journey fosters patience, resilience, and a commitment to long term investment in research. It reframes the conversation from one of frustration to one of opportunity: each incomplete therapy, partial success, or unexpected insight is a stepping stone toward eventual mastery.

Moreover, the persistence of incurable conditions provides a lens to reflect on human curiosity and ambition. Our drive to confront the unknown, to attempt interventions despite uncertainty, and to seek understanding in the face of complexity is a hallmark of intellectual youth. It is this very curiosity, coupled with perseverance, that fuels innovation. The diseases we cannot yet cure challenge us to push boundaries, question assumptions, and develop novel approaches. They act as catalysts for scientific creativity, driving the evolution of knowledge and the refinement of methodologies.

Global inequities in healthcare further emphasize that human "youth" is multifaceted. Even when therapies exist, disparities in access, infrastructure, and socioeconomic conditions prevent widespread benefit. Diseases that remain incurable in

practice, despite partial therapeutic advances, highlight not only scientific immaturity but also the developmental stage of global health systems. Addressing these inequities is part of the maturation process, requiring coordinated investment, policy innovation, and ethical commitment to ensure that scientific progress translates into tangible benefits for all populations.

In conclusion, the existence of incurable diseases serves as a mirror reflecting the youth of humanity in scientific, technological, ethical, and societal terms. It is a reminder that complexity often outpaces current capability and that mastery requires cumulative knowledge, careful experimentation, and innovative thinking. Rather than viewing the absence of cures as failure, we should interpret it as evidence that our understanding is still developing, that our tools are still evolving, and that our systems for applying knowledge are still maturing. Recognizing this youth inspires patience, humility, and continued investment in research, education, and global health infrastructure. Each step forward—whether incremental or revolutionary—represents the growth of a discipline still in adolescence, moving toward the eventual capacity to cure diseases that today seem insurmountable. Embracing the perspective of scientific youth allows us to celebrate progress, learn from setbacks, and maintain the curiosity and ambition that drive humanity toward eventual mastery over biological complexity.

■

Received: October 28, 2025 | Revised: December 29, 2025 | Accepted: January 30, 2026

References

Alsayb, M. A. (2025). Innovations in immunotherapy for autoimmune diseases: Recent breakthroughs and future directions. Frontiers in Immunology, 16, Article 1647066. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2025.1647066

Ariga, H. (2015). Common mechanisms of onset of cancer and neurodegenerative diseases. Biological & Pharmaceutical Bulletin, 38(6), 795–808. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1248/bpb.b15-00125

Fischer, D. S., Villanueva, M. A., Winter, P. S., Shalek, A. K., et al. (2025). Adapting systems biology to address the complexity of human disease in the single-cell era. Nature Reviews Genetics, 26(8), 514–531.DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41576-025-00821-6

Gunasekaran, B., Arifin, A. H., Wong, W. H. Y., et al. (2025). Precision medicine in neurodegenerative diseases: From research to clinical practice. Progress in Brain Research, 297, 1–52. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.pbr.2025.08.006

Jasieniecka, A., & Domingues, I. (2025). CRISPR-Cas9 and its bioinformatics tools: A systematic review. Current Issues in Molecular Biology, 47(5), 307. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/cimb47050307

Lazoka, S. (2025). Incurable diseases: Challenges and progress. Multidisciplinary Journal of Science and Technology, 5(6), 2055–2057. https://www.mjstjournal.com/index.php/mjst/article/view/4336

Lin, Y., Yoo, J. M., Vendruscolo, M., & Lee, Y.-H. (2025). Disease–disease interactions: Molecular links of neurodegenerative diseases with cancer, viral infections, and type 2 diabetes. Translational Neurodegeneration, 14, 52. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40035-025-00507-3

Menon, A. V., Song, B., Chao, L., et al. (2025). Unraveling the future of genomics: CRISPR, single-cell omics, and applications in cancer and immunology. Frontiers in Genome Editing, 7, Article 1565387. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fgeed.2025.1565387

Park, S.-J., Lee, G. E., Cho, S. M., & Choi, E.-H. (2025). Recent applications, future perspectives, and limitations of the CRISPR-Cas system. Molecular Therapy – Nucleic Acids, 28, 102634. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omtn.2025.102634

Sharma, A. (2025). Recent advancements in the therapeutic approaches for Alzheimer's disease. MedChemDaily, 2025. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1039/d4md00630e

Weiner, H. L. (2025). Immune mechanisms and shared immune targets in neurodegenerative diseases. Nature Reviews Neurology, 21(1), 67–85. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41582-024-01046-7