SYLLABUS

REL 384: Religion, Ethics and Health (31162)

Spring 2014

David Craig, CA 335A, 274-3689, davcraig@iupui.edu
Office hours: Monday 12:00-2:00 pm, Wednesday 9:00-10:00 am, and by appointment

Course Description
Today’s field of bioethics is largely structured by four philosophical principles—autonomy, beneficence, justice and nonmaleficence. These secular principles are a good fit with the legal system of individual rights and the capitalist marketplace in the United States. What can religious traditions add to the public’s understanding, evaluation and discussion of ethical issues in medical practice and health care delivery? What role should such western religious themes as divine gift, life’s sanctity, bodily integrity, health as wholeness, natural order, creative freedom, human vulnerability, covenantal duty, prophetic justice and common good play in debates about the goals, means, limits, distribution and regulation of health care? Through readings on organ donation, technological assistance in creating, controlling and enhancing human life, care for the dying, health and healing, and health care reform, we will explore a range of Christian and Jewish responses to these issues and analyze the sources, norms and approaches at work in representative arguments. We will also examine the cultural, economic and legal contexts in which health care decisions and policies are made.

Course Goals
• To sharpen students’ analytical skills and their abilities to argue persuasively about ethical issues in writing and speaking
• To examine the basic norms (e.g., divine gift, prophetic justice), key definitions (e.g., life, well-being) and moral sources (e.g., scripture, tradition, reason, experience) used in different religious arguments about health care in the U.S.
• To relate religious ideals of health and public debates about health care policy to the social, cultural, economic, legal and political factors that influence and sometimes frustrate them
• All Religious Studies courses are taught in accordance with IUPUI’s Principles of Undergraduate Learning http://www.iport.iupui.edu/selfstudy/tl/PULs, with particular emphasis on Principle #5, “Understanding Society and Culture.”

Summary of Course Requirements
• Regular attendance and informed participation, including five sets of discussion questions out of the eleven dates assigned to your group A or B, with the first two sets submitted no later than Mar. 3 (see end of syllabus for details): 10%
• 2-3 page Concept Application Paper, due Jan. 22 or 27 (see end of syllabus): 10%
• Two 6-7 page Formal Papers, due Mar. 10 and either Apr. 9 or May 5: 20% each
• Argument Analysis Paper (due Mar. 26) and participation in formal debate on Apr. 2 or 7: 15%
• 2 page Healthy Communities report on a community event that you attend: 5%
• Take home final exam due Friday, May 9, 4pm, CA335A: 20%

Skills and Expectations
This course combines critical reflection on health care with close reading of moral arguments. Critical reflection requires us to apply our perspectives and questions to course readings and to the various forces that shape health and medicine in the U.S. today. Close reading requires us to appreciate and evaluate the premises, claims and concepts in our authors’ arguments. The success of this course depends on students’
preparation and involvement. You are expected to come to every class with questions and observations about specific passages in the assigned readings. You are encouraged to try out your ideas in class, clarifying and improving them by taking the risk of thinking out loud. The debate offers opportunities to construct arguments in public. In written work you are expected to argue for a thesis, demonstrate a clear, analytical grasp of course readings, and use specific textual evidence in support of your claims.

Attendance, Participation and Discussion Questions/Comments
I expect you to attend every class. Unless you can document a medical emergency—something on the scale of a mental breakdown or an unexpected surgery—I count all absences. If you accrue five absences, your participation grade will drop 10 points. For each additional absence, your participation grade will drop 2 more points. I take attendance at the start of every class. If you are late, you must speak to me after class to get counted as present. The 100-point participation grade is based half on your in-class contributions—asking questions, directing us to passages in the readings, responding to other students, making useful connections (50 points)—and half on your Discussion Questions (50 points). I accept discussion questions only if I receive them by 9 am on a day assigned to your group. I give half-credit if you don’t attend class that day. You must submit the first two sets no later than Mar. 3. For a fuller explanation of these requirements, see the end of the syllabus.

Deadlines and Policies for Written Work
The Concept Application Paper and the Argument Analysis Paper must be submitted in class on the days they are due. These assignments are designed to promote class discussion. As a result, late work will receive a 20-point deduction. If you must miss class on the day you are submitting this paper, then email it to me by the start of class (10-point deduction). On formal papers, I give extensions in emergencies, but you must contact me no later than the day the paper is due. Otherwise late papers will be marked down by 1/6th of a grade per day. On the first formal paper (due Mar. 10), I will allow rewrites for an averaged grade provided that you discuss my comments with me first.

I expect a hardcopy of all written work. I will not accept the excuse that your e-mail attachment did not get through to me. If you don’t receive confirmation of an emailed assignment, then I have not received it, and it will be considered late. Save copies of all of your written work. To pass the course, you must submit the two formal papers, the argument analysis paper and the final exam.

Plagiarism and the Web
Plagiarism is the use of another person’s words or ideas without attribution. So whenever you take words from or whenever your ideas or expressions have been shaped by another author or source (other than me), you must reference these borrowings and contributions. Today the most common abuses of this rule involve the worldwide web. The web offers abundant information about the issues we will be discussing in the course. Much of this information is uneven, biased or wrong. If you consult sites on the web, you are responsible for evaluating their quality (see: http://www.ulib.iupui.edu/research/howto - internet). Relying on flawed information may lower your grade. You must also give citations for every website you use in any way. If, on papers, you fail to cite your sources, whether you use page references for books or URL’s for websites, I will return your paper without a grade. To get a grade on the paper, you will have to add the necessary references. I may also use the anti-plagiarism software “Turnitin.com” to guarantee that the work in your paper is all your own. Plagiarism is the chief offense in academic writing, and a finding of plagiarism will result in an “F” for the course and notification of the appropriate authorities (see Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct: http://www.iupui.edu/code/).

Adaptive Education Services
For students who require particular types of accommodation and assistance, please contact IUPUI’s Adaptive Education Services (AES). You can contact AES by phone, 274-3241 (voice) or 278-2050 (TDD/TTY), and e-mail, aes@iupui.edu. The website is: http://www.iupui.edu/~diversity/aes/.
Grading Scale
I use the Oncourse gradebook to calculate grades. I will give a numerical score for each assignment, and these scores will be weighted as indicated above. The final grade will follow this grading scale:

A = 100-93%; A- = 92-90%; B+ = 89-87%; B = 86-83%; B- = 82-80%; C+ = 79-77%; C = 76-73%; C- = 72-70%; D+ = 69-67%; D = 66-63%; D- = 62-60%; F = 59% or below

Required Readings (available for purchase at the IUPUI Bookstore):

Other required readings are available through Oncourse, University Library’s electronic databases and course reserves, or the web. *I expect you to bring the assigned readings to every class.*

Readings and Assignments
A or B = assigned dates for groups A or B to submit discussion questions
OnC = Oncourse (see Resources)
REC = recommended reading; *required if you write a paper on the topic or if you are a graduate student*
ULR = University Library Reserves

Starting to Think Together: Ethical Duties, Individual Choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 13</td>
<td>Introductory Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 15</td>
<td>Religion, Ethics, and Health in the Public Sphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Cahill, Theological Bioethics</em>, Introduction and chap. 1, pp. 1-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manny Fernandez and Erick Eckholm, “Pregnant, and Forced to Stay on Life Support,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 20</td>
<td>NO CLASS – Martin Luther King, Jr. Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 22</td>
<td>Duties of Healers: Conceptual Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William F. May, “Code and Covenant or Philanthropy and Contract?,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hastings Center Report</em> 5 (1975) 29-38 (JSTOR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Due Date #1 (of 2):</strong> 2-page Concept Application Paper (see end of syllabus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 27</td>
<td>Choices of Patients: Philosophical Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas R. McCormick, “Principles of Bioethics”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Darshak Sanghavi, “The Last Decision,” <em>NYTimes Magazine</em>, 12/20/09,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38-43 (Lexis-Nexis Academic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen T. Watson, “A Sister’s Agonizing Decision to Donate Kidney,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Buffalo News</em>, 1/10/10, A1 (OnC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Due Date #2 (of 2):</strong> 2-page Concept Application Paper (see end of syllabus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Part One: Bodily Integrity and the Gift of Life**

**Jan. 29  A**  
Bodily Integrity and Self-Giving in Christian Traditions  
May, *Patient’s Ordeal*, Chap. 10, pp. 175-199

**Feb. 3  B**  
Comparative Perspectives on Organ Donation  
REC: A.A. Sachedina, “Islamic Views on Organ Transplantation” (OnC)

**Part Two: Choosing and Enhancing Life with Technology**

**Feb. 5  A**  
The First Reproductive Technology: Contraception  
Pope Paul VI, *Humanae Vitae*, Parts I and II (OnC)  

**Feb. 10  B**  
Abortion and Assisted Reproduction: Catholic Perspectives  
Cahill, *Theological Bioethics*, Chap. 6, pp. 167-210  

**Feb. 12  A**  
The Natural and the Commodified: Protestant Misgivings about Assisted Reproduction  
May, *Patient’s Ordeal*, chap. 4, pp. 71-79  
Gilbert Meilaender, “Babies without Sex,” *Limits of Love*, pp. 41-47 (ULR)

**Feb. 17  B**  
Choosing Life through Technology  
Elliot Dorff, “Having Children with One’s Own Genetic Materials,” *Matters of Life and Death*, pp. 37-65 (ULR)  

**Feb. 19  A**  
Embryonic Stem Cell Research  
Cole-Turner and Waters, *God and the Embryo*, chaps. 1 and 2

**Feb. 24  B**  
Nature’s Wisdom and Human Senses?  

**Feb. 26  A**  
Moral Status: (How) Can We Draw Lines?  
Waters, Peterson and Cole-Turner, *God and the Embryo*, chaps. 4, 5 and 6
**Mar. 3**  **B**  Beneficence, Well-being and Social Responsibility  
Peters/Bennett and Zoloth, *God and the Embryo*, chaps. 8 and 10  
Cahill, *Theological Bioethics*, chap. 7, pp. 211-251

**Part Three: Approaching Death and the Ends of Life**

**Mar. 5**  **A**  Life’s Sanctity and Extraordinary Means  
David Bleich, “Karen Ann Quinlan Case,” (OnC)  
Cahill, *Theological Bioethics*, chap. 4, pp. 102-130  
REC: Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, “Vatican Declaration on Euthanasia”:  

**Mar. 10**  **B**  Refusing and Withdrawing Treatment  
Gilbert Meilaender, “Withdrawing Food and Water,” *Limits of Love*, pp. 102-111 (ULR)  
Due: Formal Paper #1 (on readings from Parts One or Two of syllabus)

**Mar. 12**  **A**  Killing and Letting Die  
Lisa Cahill, “A ‘Natural Law’ Reconsideration of Euthanasia” (OnC)  
REC: Cahill, *Theological Bioethics*, chap. 3, pp. 70-101

**Mar. 17-21**  NO CLASSES – Spring Break

**Mar. 24**  The Good Death?  
Atul Gawande, “Letting Go,” *New Yorker*, 8/2/10:  
http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2010/08/02/100802fa_fact_gawande?currentPage=all  
May, *Patient’s Ordeal*, chaps. 7 and 8, pp. 120-155  
Guest Speaker, Dr. Lyle Fettig, Palliative Care, IU School of Medicine

**Mar. 26**  Group Prep Day for Formal Debate: Oregon’s Death with Dignity Law  
Assignment and readings on Oncourse under “Resources”  
Due: 3-4 page Argument Analysis Paper

**Mar. 31**  **B**  Suffering in Judaism and Catholicism  

**Apr. 2**  **Formal Debate, Part I:** The Legality of Assisted Suicide

**Apr. 7**  **Formal Debate, Part II:** The Morality of Assisted Suicide
Part Four: Health Care Distribution: Private Choices and the Common Good

Apr. 9  A  Racial and Ethnic Disparities and Health Care Access
Emilie Townes, “‘The Doctor Ain’t Taking No Sticks,’” *Breaking the Fine Rain of Death*, pp. 81-106 (ULR)
Cahill, *Theological Bioethics*, chap. 4, pp. 131-168

Apr. 14  B  Stories of Health Care and Religious Resolutions
Zoloth, *Health Care and the Ethics of Encounter*, pp. 3-25
American Baptist Churches, “Health, Healing and Wholeness” (OnC)
National Association of Evangelicals, “Health Care Reform” (OnC)
Southern Baptist Convention, “Resolution on Health Care Reform” (OnC)
United Synagogues of Conservative Judaism, “Judaism and Health Care Reform” (OnC)
**Due Date #1 (of 2):** Formal Paper #2 (on readings from Part Three of syllabus)

Apr. 16  A  Liberal Justice and the Marketplace

Apr. 21  B  Distributing Scarce Resources

Apr. 23  A  Health Care as Covenant

Apr. 28  B  States as the Laboratories of Democracy: Competing Approaches to Reform
David Craig, “Everyone at the Table: Religious Activism and Health Care Reform in Massachusetts,” *Journal of Religious Ethics* 40.2 (2012): 335-358 (OnC)

Apr. 30  A/B  The Affordable Care Act and Community Care
Readings TBA
Take Home Final Exam handed out

May 5  Wrap-up and Review
**Due Date #2 (of 2):** Formal Paper #2 (on readings from Part Four of syllabus; or an 8-10 page research paper on a course topic approved by Prof. Craig)

May 9  Take Home Final Exam, due 4 pm in CA335A
Requirements for Discussion Questions/Comments

- **Five** times this semester you are to submit **two** discussion questions about the readings assigned for that day. *You can only submit on the days assigned to your group (A or B).* Your first two sets must submitted no later than Mar. 3. You may submit extra sets on your group’s days, either to replace lower grades or to boost your class contributions grade if you are shy about speaking in class.

- Discussion questions must be emailed by **9 am on the day of that class. Late submissions will not be accepted.** If you submit on time but miss the class, I will give half-credit. I will email grades for each submission, typically after class.

- The **10-point grading scale** will assess your demonstrated understanding of the day’s reading(s), the centrality of the concepts, issues and passages you address, and the effectiveness of your questions in sparking discussion. When there are two readings for that day, you may delve more deeply into one of them or try to connect both.

- Discussion questions need an introduction. They should come at the end of a paragraph that indicates their importance to the larger reading. Some good ways to contextualize a discussion question are to summarize the author’s main argument, define a central ethical concept, explain an illustrative example, or quote an important passage. Always be sure to provide parenthetical page references, so we can quickly find the relevant section of the reading during class discussion. Then pose a question designed to get us to think through the author’s argument, concepts, images, claims, etc. Note: I will provide a model of good discussion questions at our Jan. 15 class session.

- I will read discussion questions before class and incorporate some of them during class. As I cannot include everyone’s questions, feel free to raise your own questions.

**Grading Class Participation**
At the mid-point and end of the semester, I will assign a class participation grade of up to 25 points each (submitting extra sets of DQ/C’s can help your class contributions grade). If you accrue **five** absences, your participation grade drops 10 points. For each additional absence, your participation grade drops 2 more points.

25-23 points: Student has done all reading in advance of class and typically comes to class with passages and questions to discuss. S/he introduces these passages and raises issues for other members to discuss. S/he also listens to contrary opinions and engages other students in a discussion of their ideas. In short, an “A” student participates in an exchange of ideas.

22-20 points: Student typically has completed all of the reading assignments on time, but does not always come to class with passages and questions in mind. S/he waits for others to raise interesting issues. If the student contributes well but does not engage other students in a discussion of their ideas, then s/he falls in this range, too. In short, a “B” student may sometimes participate in an exchange of ideas but sometimes frustrates that exchange through silence or through a lack of interaction.

19-17 points: Student typically attends every class and listens attentively, but refuses to be drawn into discussion, even though s/he may have read the assignments in advance.

Less than 17 points: A student who receives a grade lower than “C” fails to bring readings to class and/or is consistently unprepared.
**Concept Application Paper Assignment**

To get us started thinking ethically as a class, students will turn in one 2-3 page Concept Application Paper on either Jan. 22 or 27. The brevity of the paper requires you to be precise in your thinking and concise in your writing. Your grade (up to 100 points) will be based on your ability to explain and apply the concept(s) you borrow from May (Jan. 22) or McCormick (Jan. 27). Grades will also reflect how fully you understand and draw from these readings and the case studies. Papers should be typed and double-spaced, with parenthetical page references. Papers are due in class. Late papers will receive a 20-point deduction. If you must miss class, email me the assignment by class time (10-point deduction).

**Due Jan. 22:** Read May’s article on the four models for conceiving the duties of healers: code, covenant, philanthropy or contract. Explain and illustrate one of the models and the types of healing relationships that characterize it. Feel free to use May’s contrasts among the four models to explain the model you chose. Then using a current issue in U.S. health care or a good or bad experience with a health care that you know about, explain how your chosen model provides ethical guidance about how best to handle this issue or experience.

**Due Jan. 27:** Read McCormick’s overview of the four principles in bioethics—autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence and justice, and read the two articles on ethical quandaries in organ donation: Can organs be removed from patients who are not fully brain dead? How can a live kidney donor choose between two needy siblings? Choose an article, and apply one (or at most two) of the four principles, showing how the principle(s) resolves or fails to resolve the ethical quandary in your chosen article. Be sure to define and illustrate your chosen principle(s) before applying it. State your sense of the correct decision somewhere in the paper.