

Informed Consent (Part 2)

Tuskegee: a case involving the ethicality of exploiting the poor for research, and also of using placebo.

Tuskegee violates IC*. Worse still, Tuskegee violates the Nuremberg Code (p.61)

Exercise: Formulate a valid argument about the moral status of the Tuskegee Study based on principle IC*.

Exercise: Find the specific aspects of the Nuremberg Code which Tuskegee violates. Formulate an argument about the moral status of the Tuskegee study based on the Nuremberg Code.

Willowbrook: a case involving research on mentally retarded children.

Goldby's first argument against the ethicality Willowbrook:

1. Any experiment involving children as subjects that could have used adults instead is morally unjustifiable.
2. The Willowbrook Study was an experiment involving children that could have used adults instead.
3. Therefore the Willowbrook Study is morally unjustifiable.

Goldby's second argument against the ethicality Willowbrook:

1. Any study involving children as subjects that does not provide the possibility of some direct benefit to those children is morally unjustifiable.
2. The Willowbrook Study was a study involving children that did not provide the possibility of some direct benefit to those children.
3. Therefore the Willowbrook Study is morally unjustifiable.

Edsall: p.56-57 Turns Krugman's defense into a positive argument in favor of moral justifiability of Willowbrook.

1. If an experiment poses no greater risk to the subjects than are already naturally incurred, and the subjects are likely to receive better medical care within the parameters of an experiment than outside it, then use of those subjects is morally justified.
2. Willowbrook was such a study.
3. Therefore Willowbrook is morally justified.

Judgment on Willowbrook: Ramsey Responds to Krugman.

Extracto exercise: Locate Ramsey's argument in his essay and put it into a simple, valid logical form. Once you have extracted the argument, explain and evaluate it.