

PHI 213: MEDICAL AND BIO-ETHICS THIRD PAPER TOPICS

Due Date for paper: Wednesday, 12/10/25, in class.

- **Late Paper Policy:** I will not accept late papers unless you have an excused absence (arranged in advance in almost every case).
- **Drafts:** If you would like to turn in a draft for me to look over, the due date for drafts is on or before Wednesday, 12/3/25, in class. Drafts must be typed and double-spaced.
- **Papers should be at least 4 pages but no more than 6 (double-spaced, size 12 font, 1" margin) pages.** Format your paper as you see my [Good Paper Sample](#) formatted.
- **Rubric:** The grading criteria and style requirements are in my "[Writing Philosophy 213 Papers](#)," on my website, and these criteria and requirements (including everything in the "Hints" and topics below) will be used to assess your papers.

The Topics

Using only our assigned textbook (but using the author's words and not Vaughn's summaries) unless otherwise specified in the topics (not AI), and when necessary citing relevant readings and authors we've covered in class to date (citing page/column numbers when you do so), choose **one (1)** of these topics and compose an essay that answers the questions. **You are required to directly quote (not paraphrase) and cite at least one author that we read in class related to your case--at least four sentences, not four phrases, and not only 4 consecutive sentences from one author and one passage that makes one point!--whether they agree with you or not, in analyzing your case;** for instance, you may use the required author(s) to support your view, or use an author as an objector to your position and then respond to that objection [see each topic for the required author(s)].

1. Refer to **Chapter 8, Case 1 ("The Fate of Frozen Embryos")** on pp. 407c2-408c1 of Vaughn's *Bioethics*, and answer **all** of the questions there, *in the order in which they are asked at the end of the case, in separate paragraphs*. Fill in or point out any significant details that are missing, if necessary. *Be sure to raise and respond to at least two good objections to your views about what to do in this situation, in separate paragraphs* (see Hints below). [Notes: (1) Relevant readings (that must be directly quoted, either from only one required reading or more or from each one, whether or not you quote other authors we read or did not read in class): **Singer** on IVF, **Marquis** on abortion (given his argument that the embryo is an individual and has a "future like ours"). (2) *The first question of the topic is asking about all these options: (a) continual cryopreservation for a charge, (b) continual cryopreservation at no charge, (c) donation for reproductive use by other couples, (d) disposal prior to cryopreservation, (e) disposal following cryopreservation, (f) donation for research, and (g) embryologist training. The question allows you to choose more than one option, so mention all of the acceptable ones and state why they are acceptable, and why the other options are unacceptable to you.*]
2. Refer to **Chapter 8, Case 3 ("Cloning to Bring Back a Child")** on p. 409 of Vaughn's *Bioethics*, and answer **all** of the questions there, *in the order in which they are asked at the end of the case, in order, in separate paragraphs*. Fill in or point out any significant details that are missing, if necessary. *Be sure to raise and respond to at least two good objections to your views about what to do in this situation, in separate paragraphs* (see Hints below). [Notes: (1) Relevant readings (that must be directly quoted, either from only one required reading or more or from each one, whether or not you quote other authors we read or did not read in class): **Brock** on cloning. (2) Make sure you do not make it sound like Brock is only for or against

cloning, because he is not clearly on one side, and that would confuse your reader, if he or she has not read Brock's article.]

3. Refer to **Chapter 9, Case 1 ("Selecting Babies")** on pp. 483c2-484 of Vaughn's *Bioethics*, and answer **all** of the questions there, *in the order in which they are asked at the end of the case, in separate paragraphs*. Fill in or point out any significant details that are missing, if necessary. *Be sure to raise and respond to at least two good objections to your views about what to do in this situation, in separate paragraphs (see Hints below)*. [Note: Relevant readings (that must be directly quoted, either from only one required reading or more or from each one, whether or not you quote other authors we read or did not read in class): **McMahan**.]
4. Refer to **Chapter 9, Case 2 ("Causing Deaf Children")** on p. 484c2-485c1 of Vaughn's *Bioethics*, and answer **all** of the questions there, *in the order in which they are asked at the end of the case, in separate paragraphs*. Fill in or point out any significant details that are missing, if necessary. NOTE: There are four stance questions. If you answer the 3rd question No, then for your 4th stance, you need to refer back to that—since you answered No to question 3, then you do not think deliberately selecting impaired embryos is equally morally wrong. *Be sure to raise and respond to at least two good objections to your views about what to do in this situation, in separate paragraphs, (see Hints below)*. [Note: Relevant readings (that must be directly quoted, either from only one required reading or more or from each one, whether or not you quote other authors we read or did not read in class): **McMahan**.]
5. Refer to **Chapter 10, Case 1 ("Doctor-Aided Suicide for 'Vulnerable Groups'")** on pp. 564c2-565 of Vaughn's *Bioethics*, and answer **all** of the questions there, in order, *in separate paragraphs*. **I have changed the case questions; read the Notes at the end of this topic!** Fill in or point out any significant details that are missing, if necessary. *Be sure to raise and respond to at least two good objections to your views about what to do in this situation, in separate paragraphs (see Hints below)*. [Notes: (1) Relevant readings (that must be directly quoted, either from only one required reading or more or from each one, whether or not you quote other authors we read or did not read in class): **Brock** (on Voluntary Active Euthanasia), **Callahan**, and/or possibly **Rachels**. (2) Do not answer these questions in the topic: "What might someone who is opposed to legalization say about this study? Or someone who favors legalization?" and change these questions to this one: "Do you support legalization of physician-assisted suicide in the form of Oregon's Death With Dignity Act? Why or why not?" (The reason for this is that you'll already be giving your opinion throughout the topic and you must raise and respond to objections anyway.)]
6. Refer to **Chapter 11, Case 3 ("Should We Have Universal Health Care?")** on p. 647 of Vaughn's *Bioethics*, and answer **all** of the questions there, *in the order in which they are asked at the end of the case, in separate paragraphs*. Fill in or point out any significant details that are missing, if necessary. *Be sure to raise and respond to at least two good objections to your view about what to do in this situation, in separate paragraphs (see Hints below)*. [Notes: (1) Relevant readings (that must be directly quoted, either from only one required reading or more or from each one, whether or not you quote other authors we read or did not read in class): **Daniels**. (2) Even though the questions have you review both sides, you still need to argue against your view with two objections and replies. Also, as usual, make sure you say in your introduction (and conclusion) that you will address (or did address) pros and cons. And (3) Make sure you answer the 4th question in the textbook, about the negative and positive effects, even though you will have already given your opinion in favor or against universal health care in the first question.]
7. Refer to **Chapter 12, Case 1 ("Withdrawing Ventilators from COVID patients")** on pp. 709c2-710c1 of Vaughn's *Bioethics*, and answer **all** of the questions there, *in the order in which they are asked at the end of the case, in order, in separate paragraphs*. Fill in or point out any significant details that are missing, if necessary. *Be sure to raise and respond to at least two good objections to your views about what to do in this situation, in separate paragraphs (see Hints below)*. [Note: Relevant readings (that must be directly quoted, either

from only one required reading or more or from each one, whether or not you quote other authors we read or did not read in class): **Emmanuel, Persad, et al.**]

8. Refer to **Chapter 13, Case 3 ("Racial Bias in the Emergency Room")** on pp. 739c1 of Vaughn's *Bioethics*, and answer *all* of the questions there, *in the order in which they are asked at the end of the case*, in order, *in separate paragraphs*. Fill in or point out any significant details that are missing, if necessary. *Be sure to raise and respond to at least two good objections to your views about what to do in this situation, in separate paragraphs (see Hints below)*. [Notes: (1) Relevant readings (that must be directly quoted, either from only one required reading or more or from each one, whether or not you quote other authors we read or did not read in class): **Root**. (2) You might think that it's a short case so it will be easier; but keep in mind that you have to write 4-6 pages on it; if you don't think you can write the minimum, please pick another topic.]
9. **NAME YOUR OWN TOPIC**: Is there an issue you really wanted to study/address or a topic you wanted to write about but were not yet able to do so? You may name your own topic, *provided* that you discuss the topic first with me, and you (will be required to) turn in a draft. [Warning: If you do not turn in a draft for this option, you will receive an F for this assignment (the draft requirement is for your protection).] Also, you will still be required to raise and respond to at least two good objections to your view for this option.

HINTS:

First, make sure you read the [2nd and 3rd paper template here](#), and format your paper, intro, etc. just like that.

Second, you should have your paper organized in general by paragraphs, as follows:

1. **INTRODUCTION** – First, please read [this 2nd and 3rd paper template](#) carefully, about how to write the Introduction. (i) Set up the case carefully: Give essential information (for instance, the name of a patient, age, symptoms, drug names, and relevant facts—see [the template](#) for an example), but do not merely type Vaughn's words about the case (you can use a phrase here or there, but do not just type the whole thing in - you will not have enough room to do that in almost any case). (You should assume that I don't know anything about it.) (ii) It is not important to state why there is a controversy as much as you should say what is happening in the case, so leave out statements in favor or against; (iii) Be sure to include your *stances* on the questions; and (iv) Mention that you'll raise and respond to two objections against your view. [**NOTE**: Do *not* list the questions, even if you answer them in the Introduction: Simply make a statement about the way in which you will answer the question. For example, if the first question is, "Should the nurse punch the patient?" You should write in the Introduction, "In this paper, I will argue that the nurse should not punch the patient" **or** "I will argue that the nurse should punch the patient." And then you can link the statements together, as follows: "I will argue that the nurse should not punch the patient, the doctor should not resign from the hospital, and the test should be done."]
2. **ANSWER EVERY QUESTION, in separate paragraphs, in the order in which they are asked at the end of the case**. Begin *each* paragraph with your stance on the question in the first sentence (see [this template](#) for more information): E.g., "The nurse should not punch the patient." (or "The nurse should not punch the patient for several reasons: ..."). Somewhere in your paper, either while answering the questions, or in the objections and/or replies, use the authors from the readings that we've covered that are relevant to answering these questions – note that you can mention authors' views only because you think they have a *wrong* view about the issue as well. You need to mention at least one author, and more than two of their sentences. You **may** bring up other authors who are not listed in the relevant readings, including readings from the book that we did not cover in class; but you still must mention at least one author we read, in a significant way. Also, keep in mind that authors mention points

against their view, so be sure not to represent the author in your quotations or paraphrases as being in favor of a view they are really against, or vice versa. **Make sure that you cite the page numbers for where you got the idea that an author is in favor or against something, whether you paraphrase or directly quote the author(s).** EX: "Lipkin argues that it is a practical impossibility to tell the patients "the whole truth" (147c2)." [See this link for how to cite columns with the pages.](#) Make sure you cite the page numbers whenever you refer to any author in the textbook, whether you paraphrase or directly quote what the author(s) say(s). Do not begin a sentence with a quotation mark: Always introduce every quotation to your reader; for instance, "Thomson states, "" (360c2)." If you have the e-book version of the textbook, please write "E-Book" up by your name on the first page, so I will know that you don't have columns in your version of the reading. **[NOTES: (1) If there is a follow-up question that is very directly related to one of the questions, you *may* address both of those questions in one paragraph.** EX: "Should the nurse punch the patient in this case? If so, how hard should s/he punch the patient?" (or "Why?") These are so related, they can be addressed in the same paragraph. And, if you answer this kind of question, "I would argue that the nurse should not punch the patient because ...," then you should still state something to this effect: "Since I argued that the nurse should not punch the patient, obviously there is no question of how hard s/he should punch the patient." (This acknowledges that you realize there was another question in the case, and you addressed it.) But in general, answer the questions in separate paragraphs. If you have any questions about when to combine them and when not to, please ask me! (2) Do not ignore, change, or state the opposite of any feature(s) of the case. (3) Do not take the authors' points out of context. EX: If author X brings up X's opponents' arguments in X's article, you should not cite that sentence or point; you should instead cite X's opponent's view - cite the person who really believes the view. (One exception is when an author **only** discusses pros and cons and does not take a stand.) (4) **If** you bring up the Hippocratic Oath, make sure to quote the relevant phrase from the textbook, and cite the page as well. (5) You need to support claims that are facts that you can find researched on the Internet. For example, "There are lots of parents waiting to adopt unwanted children" or "Few parents want to adopt unwanted children." For these kinds of claims, you need to look for reputable research, statistics, or facts from an AZ Adoption Agency, or something like that, so you're not merely claiming something that can really help your side of the argument, without supporting it.]

- 3. FIRST OBJECTION TO YOUR VIEW** – In its own paragraph, give your opponent (either your own objection or another author who does not agree with you) a whole paragraph to voice *one* (not lots of different points), *strong* (not a weak one that's easy to reply to), *developed* (i.e., not one or two sentences -- give an example and explain it well) objection against your view. **[NOTES: (1) Place the objections in the most logical place:** e.g., if your objection has to do with your first answer to the questions, then you should have your first objection and reply paragraphs come after your first "answer" paragraph. (2) **If** you have more than one objection for the **same** question, make sure you answer all of them, and arrange the paragraphs in this way: OBJ1, REPLY1, OBJ2, REP2, etc.]
- 4. YOUR REPLY TO THE FIRST OBJECTION YOU JUST RAISED** – Answer the objection to the best of your ability. If you cannot answer the objection, switch sides and argue opposite to what you originally said (I'll have no way of knowing what you originally were going to answer). Pick the most plausible side as you see it and defend that side of the argument.
- 5. SECOND OBJECTION TO YOUR VIEW** – **[NOTE: Again, as above, place the second objection in the most logical place:** if your objection has to do with your third answer to the questions, then you should have your second objection and reply paragraphs come after your third "answer" paragraph.]
- 6. REPLY TO THE SECOND OBJECTION**
- 7. CONCLUSION** – See [this template](#) for the way in which to write the Conclusion. Review what case you covered **very** briefly (see below), how you answered each of the questions (and mention your answers in the order in which you covered them - do not put them all out of order),

mention at least **that** you raised and responded to two objections, and any last thoughts about the case -- perhaps you can say something about future implications of your view (or the issue). Begin it like this: "In conclusion, I examined the case of _____ and argued that Nurse L. should administer the drug, that the hospital was morally wrong for killing Steve W., and that Doctor Q. did not provide informed consent to Steve W." [NOTES: (i) Do **not** write, "I went through the case of nurse L and Billy, and answered some questions about the case." -- this is too vague, and I do not want you to list the questions here either, just like the Introduction instructions above state. (ii) Do **not** mention new analysis or quote another author in order to help you answer questions in the case: You **may** have a quote that is generally related to the case (that is, **not** a required quotation from a required author); just do not put new content into the conclusion that you have not already discussed -- move that kind of thing to the place where you are answering the questions in the body of the paper.]