Final Draft: Morality from an Author's Standpoint

Shawn Galdeen and John Ohlfest
Biology 1101: Heredity in Human Society

Assignment #2: Final draft: Morality from an author's standpoint
Due Date: 12/06/2002 beginning of class

Requirements: The paper should be 12-15 pages in length, double-spaced, 12 point Helvetica font, with 1 inch margins on top and sides. The first paper you turned in will serve as a rough draft for this final paper. However, the final paper has additional content and should be improved upon from your first paper. You should rewrite the parts of your first paper based on the comments you received when it was returned to you. Cutting and pasting parts from your first paper into this final paper may cause you to lose points. That is, points will be taken away if you don't try to improve from your first paper (which we have copies of). You must use the following outline to structure your paper. Your paper should have these six sections, titled accordingly:

4) Clearly explain what the moral problem is.
   A.) What is the relevance of the moral dilemma in the case study you have chosen? What is at stake and why does it matter? Only after you have thoroughly elucidated the problem, can you hope to find a solution or choose a moral stance.

2) What are the arguments?
   A.) You should do your own research for this final paper. Your task is to come up with new facts using outside sources. You must have new facts that were not included in your first paper. Feel free to use books, journals, and the internet as references. However only 25% of your references can be taken from the internet. You must cite any references you use, this is required and adds validity to your paper.
   B.) What are the facts used to support each side of the argument. Do the facts follow, that is, do the facts truly support the conclusion in a logical manner? Are there other factors that have not been considered that would lend strength to one particular moral stance?

3) Clearly explain the author's moral theory.
   A.) Choose one of the chapters in the text (the elements of moral philosophy) and state what the author's philosophy on morality is. What criteria does the author use when making decisions? For example, if you choose chapter ten, your task would be to describe Kant's categorical imperative and his concept of an absolute maxim. What does the author believe and why?
5) Apply the moral theory of the author to your case study problem.

A.) Now that you have explained what criteria the author uses to make moral decisions you must state what the author would do to solve the moral dilemma in your case study. Make sure to refer to specific principles that the author would adhere to in making his/her decision. Be careful to cite any direct quotes you use from the author, plagiarism will not be tolerated.

6) Evaluate the author's moral theory.

A.) What are the strengths and weaknesses of the moral theory in question? Does the author's moral theory contradict itself and is it applicable to the real world? What would the world be like if we all made decisions based on the author's moral theory? Is there any way you would change or improve upon the author's moral theory? The aim here is to critically evaluate the author's viewpoint on morality and ethics and if possible improve on it. Feel free to be creative but make sure to support your ideas with examples and facts.

7) What are the conclusions?

A.) Now that you have evaluated another person's viewpoint on moral decision-making, how would you resolve the moral conflict in the case study you have chosen? Would you change your response from the first paper you submitted? Why or why not? What are the moral principles to which you adhere and how do they compare to the author's? In sum, do your best to convince the person reading this paper that you have made the right decision.

Points will be given (or taken away) based on the following criteria:

1) Was the paper written in the required format?

2) Did the paper answer the two questions at the end of the case study it was based on and the questions listed in the outline above?

3) Were revisions made to the final paper relative to the first paper?

4) Did this final paper contain new facts (not included in first paper) from outside sources?

5) How well the author's moral theory was described and applied to the moral problem.

6) The overall quality of writing (clear, concise, accurate, convincing).