

Name

Instructor

Course

Date

Case Study 4

1. Suppose the “subjects” had live cancer cells implanted in them. How would you respond to the researcher?

The argument of science that can be used to respond to the ‘subjects’ who had live cancer cell is that science is focused on finding the truth about a particular area of research. According to the principle of social realism of science, it is necessary to know the truth about an area of study in science so that analysis of that information can be done (Godfery-Smith 174). Thus, the subjects could be asked to provide the exact information pertaining to the study so that an analysis of the information could be based on true information that would enable an action to be taken or a conclusion made regarding the area of study. It is also important to get the exact information from the subjects because it ensures relevance of the research question to understanding the problem experienced by the people in real life situation. Another reason why deception may be justified in obtaining information from the ‘subjects’ is that having live cancer cells is part of a natural world according to the natural philosophy of science.

According to the natural philosophy of science, the immaterial world is composed of course, nature of truth and information, thus ensuring reliability, certainty and objectivity of scientific information (Godfery-Smith, 160). This is because if the truth is not obtained during scientific research, it is not easy to come up with a solution which would address the problem experienced in real life situation. For instance, in this case, the process of providing the true information

about having cancer cells would be useful in coming up with a recommendation on how the affected people can be helped to overcome the problems they are undergoing.

2. Suppose people were made to feel like two cents about themselves because they did things they regretted but went along anyway

In a cases where people are made to feel like two cents about themselves as a result of doing things they regretted, it would be important to remember that it is important to encourage subjects to participate in a study by ensuring their contribution is based only on the information they provide for the purpose of solving a problem under study. The study would be justified by explaining that social realism of science is based in the principle of criticality of the empiricist traditions (Godfery-Smith, 161). This ensures the hypotheses are tested and accuracy in obtaining information is achieved by being critical of the characteristics of information provided by the subjects but not actually being critical of the subjects themselves.

Another argument that supports this action is that scientific study is based on the idea that scientific theories are based on the idea that it is possible to provide knowledge about unobservable entities, forces and procedures and that in order to understand progress in understanding scientific processes, we are required to do so (Boyd 86). The other reason that would be used to support the idea is that the information would be used for the purpose of analysis, thus enabling scientists to make predictions pertaining to a number of variables based on the information about present state of variables obtained from the subjects.

The other argument that supports the idea is that through collection of the right information, there was the possibility of causing a state of impingement into the privacy of the subjects but this is the nature of naturalistic philosophy of science: to obtain information that is important in analyzing the research problem.

3. Are there any situations in which it might be justified to lie, deceive, even harm innocent people to acquire valuable scientific knowledge?

There are a number of situations where it would be justified to lie, deceive, harm innocent people so that valuable scientific information can be obtained. For instance, in a case where the information is focused on finding the exact problem experienced in real life situation so that a particular problem is solved in real life situation by analyzing the problem and coming up with a recommendation on how the problem should be solved (Ryder 56). In certain cases, the people may be unwilling to provide information which is not available in another place, thus, it would not be possible to get such information in another place.

Consequently, by deceiving the people, it is possible to get the right information which enables understanding of the problem under study. This is supported by the socialism theory of science which states that provided no physical or psychological harm is caused to the subjects, the method used to obtain information from the subjects should be justified provided the relevant information is obtained (Boyd 95). In certain cases, the subjects do not understand the reason why a particular study is conducted and how the responses would be significant for human learning, they may be harmed, deceived or lied to so that they can provide accurate information that ensures the right conclusion is reached in the study.

4. What sorts of value judgments are at issue here, and how might they be justified?

There are a number of value judgments that can be observed in this case. For instance, the medical researcher values scientific information he needs to obtain from the subjects. The importance of the need to get the information makes the medical researcher use deception so that the subjects can be convinced to provide the information which would aid in understanding the scientific problem that the medical researcher tries to understand (Godfery-Smith 152). Thus, the

medical researcher puts the significance of the information as a first priority to the need to be honest with the subjects.

Another value judgment that can be observed in this case is that the medical researcher based his action on the assumption of scientific realism which requires that correct data should be collected which enables understanding a scientific theory through analysis of observable variables (Ruse 70). This involves ensuring the right subjects are selected and those who are able to provide the most accurate information are selected in preference to those who are less likely to provide accurate information. It also recommends that it is the responsibility of the researcher to ensure all means possible are used to ensure the subjects provide the required information that enables understanding of the topic of study.

There may be the possibility that the subjects were not willing to enable the researcher accomplish the goal of collection of the right data that would assist in understanding a medical problem but could do so if they were deceived or harmed (Boyd 185). Consequently, the medical researcher opted to use this method to collect data from the subjects because he considered these subjects to be the source of the most accurate data for scientific analysis.

5. Are the values used to defend such activities scientific or extrascientific? explain

The values used to defend the activities are extra-scientific because scientific studies do not explain whether subjects involved in a research should not be deceived. This is because the method involves a research process where deception is used but the researcher bases his approach on the belief in his ability to comply with scientific research principles but also ensuring certain approaches are used which are not explained by scientific research principles but still useful in obtaining information which is significant in understanding the research problem. However, scientific principles do not explain whether deceit and harm to subjects

should not be used but it requires that no harm should be cause to the subjects or the subjects subjected to conditions that are uncomfortable to them as a result of the research. However, the researcher estimated that it would be reasonable to go against scientific values so that the objectives of the study of obtaining data that would be useful for the study could be obtained.

Work Cited

- Boyd, Richard N. *The Current Status of Scientific Realism*. In *Scientific Realism*, edited by
1984. Leplin. Bunge, Mario. *Realism and Antirealism in Social Science*. Theory and
Decision 35 (3):207-235.1993.
- Godfrey-Smith, Peter. *Theory and Reality: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003. Print.
- Rouse, Joseph. *How Scientific Practices Matter: Reclaiming Philosophical Naturalism*. Chicago
[u.a.: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2002. Print.
- Ruse, Michael. *Taking Darwin Seriously: A Naturalistic Approach to Philosophy*,
Blackwell.1986.
- Ryder, John, *American Philosophic Naturalism in the Twentieth Century*, Prometheus Books.
1994.