

Essay III – Basic Outline Worksheet

(Sample adapted from essay in *Perspectives on Argument* 290-293.)

Introduction: Understanding

What background does your reader need to know in order to understand the issue these sources disagree about?

Cloning of Dolly the sheep
possibility of applying this technology to humans

What is your first source (citation)?

- Butler, Declan, and Meredith Wadman. “Calls for Cloning Ban Sell Science Short.” *Nature* 6 Mar. 1997: 8-9. Print.
- Macklin, Ruth. “Human Cloning? Don’t Just Say No.” *US News & World Report* 10 May. 1997: 64+. Print.

What is the position of your first source?

Human cloning should not be banned.

What are the arguments your first source gives for its position?

- Human cloning may be able to provide medical benefits, including skin grafts for burn victims and bone marrow for patients undergoing cancer chemotherapy (Butler and Wadman 8).
- No one has yet made a persuasive case that human cloning would do any real harm (Macklin 64).

What is your second source (citation)?

- Carey, John. “Human Clones: It’s Decision Time.” *Business Week* 10 Aug. 1998: 32. Print.
- Pence, Gregory E. *Who’s Afraid of Human Cloning?* Lanham: Rowman, 1998. Print.
- Wilmut, Ian. “Roslin Institute Experiments: Creation of Dolly the Sheep.” *Congressional Digest* Feb. 1998: 41+. Print.

What is the position of your second source?

Human cloning should be banned.

What are the arguments your second source gives for its position?

- Cloning of humans would be unethical because the process would probably be similar to the process for cloning Dolly the sheep: it took 277 attempts to produce one live lamb, and most of the embryos which survived to implantation showed developmental abnormalities and died soon after birth (Wilmut 64).
- There is a widespread belief that parents might create unrealistic expectations for cloned children, believing they no longer have the potential limitations of their genetic ancestors (Pence 135).
- Cloning is really a major step toward regarding our children as acceptable only if they conform to the choices of our will (Carey).

1st Section: Common Ground

What common ground do the sources share? What do they agree about?

It is important to protect and care for people, which means:

- Finding new ways to treat sick patients is good.
- Parents should not judge their children based on genetic attributes chosen by the parents.
- We should not allow experiments which cause disfigurement and death in people without the consent of those people.

2nd Section: Conditional Validity

What is the root of the disagreement between your sources?

In terms of policy, they disagree about whether human cloning experiments should be banned.

In terms of their arguments, they disagree about *whose protection/care should be prioritized*, and perhaps *who/what counts as a person*.

What valid points does your first source make? (Under what conditions are these points valid?)

Finding new ways to treat sick patients is good. (Butler and Wadman argue that human cloning may be beneficial because it could be used to provide tissue—skin grafts and bone marrow—to treat sick patients.)

This point is valid under certain conditions: research on living people to pursue medical treatments is appropriate when

- the living people (on whom researchers are experimenting) have *given their permission* to be experimented on, and
- researchers *do not sacrifice human lives* to find the medical treatment.

What valid points does your second source make? (Under what conditions are these points valid?)

1. Parents should not judge their children based on genetic attributes chosen by the parents. (Pence and Cary each argue that human cloning will allow parents to choose their children's genes, which will cause parents to decide which genes are superior, which will cause parents to evaluate their children based on their genes.)

This point is valid under certain conditions: human cloning will lead to parents evaluating their children based on their genes if human cloning is *used by parents to pick and choose children*, but not if human cloning is only used for medical treatment.

2. We should not allow experiments which cause disfigurement and death in people without the consent of those people. (Wilmot suggests that human cloning experiments would be unethical because they would have results similar to the cloning of Dolly the sheep, which required 277 attempts, with 29 embryos implanted, and three-fifths of those showing developmental abnormalities and dying soon after birth.)

This point is valid under certain conditions: such experiments are unacceptable if

- the subjects of the experiment *are people* (not everyone agrees that embryos and fetuses are people, but cloned humans might die shortly after birth, like many of the

cloned sheep, and it is generally agreed that infants who die shortly after they are born are people), and

- the people who are the subjects of the experiment *have not given consent* to be experimented on (unlike adult humans, fetuses and infants cannot give consent).

Conclusion: Reconciling Positions

What is missing from the position of your first source? (Ideally, this is something which is important to the values expressed in your first source.)

The first source advocates caring for medical patients, implying the source values protecting patients, but human clones would also be patients who need protection.

The position of the first source does not offer *protection for human clones*

- before their birth, or
- after their birth (from developmental problems, from warped parental standards).

How can the second source supply what is missing in your first source? (How can this addition be reconciled to the position of the first source?)

The second source draws attention to the need to protect human clones.

We can argue for a temporary moratorium on human cloning instead of non-regulated research—this will give us time to figure out how to protect human clones and still gain medical treatments from human cloning.

What is missing from the position of your second source? (Ideally, this is something which is important to the values expressed in your second source.)

The second source advocates protecting human clones on the basis of their humanity, implying that all human beings need to be cared for, but patients who need treatments (which human cloning might provide) also need care.

The position of the second source does not offer the *opportunity for medical treatment of sick patients* which might be provided by human cloning.

How can the first source supply what is missing in your second source? (How can this addition be reconciled to the position of the second source?)

The first source draws attention to the need to pursue medical treatments through research (in this case, through research into human cloning).

We can argue for a temporary moratorium on human cloning instead of a permanent ban—after we have taken enough time to plan protections for human clones, we should pursue human cloning research for its medical benefits.