Sudarshan Srirangapatanam

**Week 12 Reflection**

**1** On the Tuesday’s debate I was on the debate team and since the very beginning of the research my view was that human germline modification was ethical. On Thursday’s topic however, I started out with agree and switched to disagree on the basis of framing of the argument. Initially they are both very clearly related they both involved changing the unborn child without consent. I believe that consent is not a problem here since it is impossible to get consent from an unborn child, since we are letting parents give consent on their children’s behalf and also because no child gives consent to be born; with or without defects.

I do believe that we have moral obligation to help our future generation to get rid of harmful diseases given that we are able to. And now the question turns to who has the say in deciding what to edit. If the parents are given chance they’ll will definitely be biased in choosing the characteristics for their child, and will start getting into aesthetics and diverge greatly from our initial purpose. One of the ethical theories that we stood on was intentions and the theory holds true if and only if the changes are limited to diseases.

In order to achieve the above and holding true to allowing human germline modification, I believe that the option the team arguing against had a plausible solutions. Letting doctors, who are not really biased for an individual baby, decide what they will edit. And drawing ideas from our arguments having government set regulations for these doctors would setup a good system that would still hold true to our original intentions.

**2.A** Taking a look at the facts we have the following things happening: A surrogate mother gains money if the baby is born, If a surrogate mother gets her full money, it is life changing for her, The couples who opt-in for this option get a baby, An egg donor gets money, The agency makes huge amounts of money, The surrogate mothers risk their prestige loss in the society, and Some surrogate mothers do not comply with the agency.

Taking a look at this most of them are very positive except for a few such as the money mothers get and compliance. To solve these problems we can start making the system legal so that we can have a greater control over the procedure, thus making it easier for us to tackle the black market problem. Since this procedure doesn’t have any basis in the utilitarian approach it is not logical to apply this theory here. We can start with rights and justice approach.

The mothers have the right to choose what is best for them and they are currently using this as a service they can offer to make their lives better for themselves. The couple who opt-in for this have a right to have kids with their DNA as much as other couples. And in the basis of this I believe that both commercial and altruistic surrogacy is ethically right given that the surrogate mothers are given full information to make informed decisions and have better compliance, have better living conditions and centers, and are paid more.

**2.B** Considering the rights and justice approach the arguments boils down to 2.A and I believe on this basis medical tourism aspect of surrogacy as described in podcast is an acceptable path to solving surrogacy problems while keeping both sides happy.