

Chris Fullerton
Weekly Report week 7

Autonomy and consent in bioethics is basically the knowledge of what is being done to the patient. The right of individuals to make decisions about their own lives and bodies. The Dr, physician, or lets say scientist, whoever is performing something with your body needs to inform you of what's going on. Once informed the individual needs to understand and voluntarily agree to treatment without coercion. Beneficence and non-maleficence is the obligation to avoid harm. This is doing what's best for the patient while causing the least amount of stress or harm. It's the balance between improvement and harm. Justice is just that justice that the patient is treated fairly without discrimination. A good example is Vaccine mandates. This sacrifices personal freedom of choice to protect a wider community. It's like checks and balances for what's considered right for the society rather than the individual.

A scenario policy for CRISPR would be permitting use for therapeutic purposes but restrict it for enhancement uses. The Beneficence and non maleficence would be allowing therapeutic editing can reduce suffering from inherited disorders. Restricting enhancements avoided risks of unknown long term harms and misuses. Autonomy and consent would fall under having future children that can't give consent. Limiting use to the therapeutic protects the future children because the therapeutic needs would stay with the individual. For justice if CRISPR were used for enhancement then it would get skewed because it would then favor the rich. Access for lower income would then become flawed. Only the rich would be able to afford it.

The muddiest point would then become an issue of how we could possibly set standards for consent for someone who does not exist. To whom are we to decide for future people? Especially if the concernese may only benefit the rich..

Used sage to guide me