

Prisoners of War

Grace Stephan, Pioneer High School Junior

You are the leader of a country currently engaged in a war that began when a portion of your country ceded from the whole and sought to form its own country. This attempted new nation has one exceptionally noticeable difference from your own: they enslave people of color.

This bloody battle has been raging for several years. Prisoners of War camps have sprung up on both sides. In the East (the ceded portion), the deadliest prison camp is Johnsonville. The economy of the East has taken a severe hit as the war has progressed. The hyperinflation, lack of resources, and lack of transportation paired with Eastern resentment towards the West has caused Johnsonville Prison Camp to be an atrocity. You have been receiving trustworthy reports of the conditions of this among other camps throughout the war. The Johnsonville prison was built to hold a maximum of 10,000 prisoners- it currently holds approximately 35,000. The only source of water for drinking, bathing, cooking, and sewage is a creek that ran through the camp and formed a swamp. Food rations consist of a small portion of raw meat or corn. On average, 100 soldiers die each day. A few of the causes of death in the camp are as follows: Asphyxia (suffocation due to insufficient oxygen and excess carbon dioxide), Enteritis (the inflammation of intestines), and smallpox (characterized by fever, vomiting, and pustular skin eruptions). Approximately 15,000 soldiers have died in this prison camp to date.

A haphazard prison exchange has occurred throughout the war. Small numbers of prisoners have been traded over enemy lines by military officers from both the East and West. The self-proclaimed President of the East has just made you a proposal to enlarge this exchange between the warring nations. However, there is a catch: this proposed exchange would only extend to white soldiers. Soldiers of color would continue to be prisoners of war or be placed into slavery in the East.

You are torn. Your first instinct is to refuse the offer on the grounds that enslavement and discrimination against a particular demographic of people are horrendous acts. You feel that by beginning this formal exchange, you would be in some way condoning these acts. If your country loses this war, these prisoners of color will likely never be freed or allowed to return home. However, you also want to free as many of your soldiers as possible from the horrible prison camps of the East. You know that if you accept the President's offer, you will be alleviating the suffering of thousands.

Study Questions

Question 1: Should you accept the President's offer?

Question 2: How does the percent of imprisoned soldiers that are people of color affect your answer to question 1, if at all?

Question 3: Do you, as the President of a nation, have a greater obligation to do what is just or to do what saves the greatest number of lives possible?

Past and Punishment
Ellie Makar-Limanov, Huron High School Junior

Notes:

1. *The following is a fictional scenario taking place in the 1980s.*

You're a philosophy professor at a large, prestigious university. Frederick Smith is one of your fellow colleagues in the philosophy department. He is a well-published researcher, a respected colleague, and two-time winner of the Best Lecturer Award; his students love him and his classes are very popular. You respect Smith a great deal and frequently discuss research topics with him. Although you do not generally meet off-campus, you consider him to be a friend.

One day, by accidental means, a group of university students working on a research project discover that Frederick Smith had, in his youth, lived in Germany. They also discover that he been a Nazi.

Truly named Friedrich Schmidt, the professor had previously been a young engineer in Nazi Germany. He had also been a member of the Nazi Party. Schmidt had conducted pioneering research on electromagnetism; while Schmidt did not conduct his research with the explicit aim of creating weaponry, it was later utilized by Nazi scientists in their creation of military weapons.

In 1948, Schmidt was one of several hundred German scientists to be transported to the U.S.; this was the result of "Operation Paperclip" (1945-1959) — a secret maneuver run by the Joint Intelligence Objective Agency (JIOA) which transported German scientists for government employment. Some time after his transportation, Schmidt abandoned the field of physics and earned his PhD in philosophy. In 1971, he was hired by the university he currently works for.

As one of the most important faculty members, you have been chosen to be a member of a board that will be to decide whether or not the university should fire Friedrich Schmidt.

The board is in complete disagreement. Some members claim that, while Schmidt had previously been a member of an immoral group, and while he had, to some extent, aided in immoral crimes, it is incorrect to punish for his mistakes for the duration of his entire life. These members argue that Schmidt has since changed, and is no longer the person he once was. To support this view, there are testimonials from his students, who say that they have never heard him express Nazistic views during his lectures in class.

Others argue that Schmidt is still the same person and ought to be held accountable for his involvement in the Nazi Party. They claim that the university ought to promptly fire Schmidt as he had been part of a movement responsible for absolutely heinous crimes that range from racial supremacy to biological experimentation to genocide. They say it is imperative to show that the university does not support such behavior.

You yourself are unsure. The board has agreed to come to a consensus by next week. Should Friedrich Schmidt be fired?

Study Questions:

1. Psychological experiments conducted after World War 2, such as the Milgram Experiment and the Stanford Prison Experiment, showed that entirely regular people could quite quickly be made to act immorally and inflict pain on others. These experiments showed how easily people could be affected by the situation they found themselves in. Some argue that a large portion of those who became Nazis were just regular people who had been in the wrong place at the wrong time. To what extent does the situation excuse an individual's behavior?
2. Schmidt's research had been used in the production of warfare — how responsible is he for this? Is it always, sometimes, or never unethical to conduct research during wartime that could potentially be used for war?
3. What are your obligations as a professor and as a member of the university? Should the fact that Schmidt is such an incredible academic asset to the university affect your judgement? As a colleague and as a friend, do you hold any personal responsibility toward Schmidt?

The Good Samaritan

Miguel Cisneros, Huron High School Senior

A Good Samaritan is defined as “someone who renders aid in an emergency to an injured person on a voluntary basis.” Most states have a Good Samaritan law that provide such people with immunity from charges against them for actions taken during the emergency. There are three circumstances that the Good Samaritan must meet to receive this immunity. First, the Good Samaritan must be cautious in giving care as to do no harm. Second, the Good Samaritan must administer care at the scene of the incident. Third, the Good Samaritan’s actions must only be motivated by providing aid. If a person follows this criteria, and by accident worsens the issue, they will most likely not receive any charges.

There has been a bike accident. Michael, a college student, has been hit by a city bus. Michael is lying five feet from the site of the impact, and his bike is lodged underneath bus. Everyone is in shock but Louie, a first-year med student, who rushes off the bus to Michael.

Louie takes note that Michael has received severe lacerations to the head and leg, a dislocated elbow, and a loss of consciousness due to blood loss. Louie predicts that Michael will bleed to death if he cannot make it to a hospital. Louie asks Michael to show him a sign that he is conscious, Michael mutters a “My leg hurts.” Louie tells Michael that he is a first year med student, and tells him that everything will be ok. Michael tries to sit up but fails, he inspects his leg and mutters “Oh no.” Louie knows that Michael’s arm is in pain, and that the pain will go away if he quickly relocated his elbow. Louie tells Michael that he will be doing this and that it will ease the pain, then cautiously proceeds. Michael sighs in relief but is still semiconscious. Michael looks at his leg and again mutters “Oh no, I can’t live without my leg, let me go otherwise if it doesn’t make it.” Michael then closes his eyes and his breathing slows. Louie is troubled by this; he is unsure if Michael is lucid enough to make such a decision rationally.

Michael’s leg does look like it may need to be amputated at best, otherwise Michael may not be able to walk properly with it. Louie calls an ambulance and reports that Michael is in serious need of medical treatment, and may not survive much longer without it. Louie is unsure about whether or not he made the right decision for Michael, he believes that life and death matters should be approached conservatively, and that his decision is correct, given the emergency and being strangers to Michael. Louie also doesn’t understand why Michael would seemingly rather die than live without a leg.

Louie follows Michael to the hospital and informs the police of exactly what happened. The police inform Louie of the Good Samaritan law and that he can gain immunity if he classifies as a Good Samaritan in this situation. The police ask Louie why he believes he does or not deserve immunity. Louie explains his reasoning clearly about why he thinks he deserves immunity. Louie believes he had an altruist intention, that he acted with caution, and that provided helpful aid during the incident.

After a day in the hospital, Louie decides to check up on Michael. A nurse who recognizes Louie says “Michael doesn’t want any visitors, he is extremely upset about his amputated leg and wishes to be alone for a while.”

Study Questions:

1. Should Louie have made the judgement call about the treatment of his leg given his knowledge? If not, why?
2. Would Louie be a Good Samaritan if he let Michael die at the scene of the incident?
3. Under Good Samaritan law, is does Louie receive immunity from charges regarding actions taken during this incident?
4. Would the nature of Louie's call for an ambulance change if he were a fourth-year med student?
5. Should patients always have the final say to end or save their life?
6. Is it necessary for Louie to report the comments Michael made to the nurses? If so, when?
7. Is there always a right action a Good Samaritan can make? Should they always make this decision?
8. What values and considerations could a Good Samaritan take into account when making decision?

Sources:

<https://definitions.uslegal.com/g/good-samaritans/>

<https://www.quitalcohol.com/news/good-samaritan-law-michigan.html>

[https://www.legislature.mi.gov/\(S\(5qyic4g0vpkwiziwgor5vawi\)\)/mileg.aspx?page=GetObject&objectName=2016-HB-5649](https://www.legislature.mi.gov/(S(5qyic4g0vpkwiziwgor5vawi))/mileg.aspx?page=GetObject&objectName=2016-HB-5649)

GMO Right to Know?

Aria Falcone, Washtenaw International High School Senior

The foods we eat every day have travelled a long journey to reach us, so how do we know their origins? As biotechnology has increased, genetically modified (GM) crops have increased in popularity due to their ability to increase crop yields, and some are resistant to certain pesticides. These crops have proved to be very valuable in parts of the world where malnutrition is common, modifying the genes in these crops to be rich in vitamins and minerals, such as “golden rice.” Although these crops have seemingly provided us with many benefits, their drawbacks aren’t fully known.

Some individuals worry that the increase in GM crops will increase the use of pesticides, whose effects may potentially be destructive. Furthermore, they worry that these crops may disrupt the food webs of their ecosystems, and may have various health effects on humans, such as increasing allergic reactions, or the transferred genes having unintended negative health effects.¹

On July 29, 2016, Former President Obama signed the National Bioengineered Food Disclosure, which requires the labelling of GMOs. However, the way in which the company chooses to label may vary, such as using a link or QR code instead of a clearly-written statement.² The changes don’t need to be made until two years after the bill was signed, and small food companies have up to a year after that to implement these decisions.

Many individuals feel that this policy is a wonderful achievement for a consumer’s access to information, and that provides food companies the accountability that is necessary. However, other groups feel that this bill does too little; companies may label their products illegibly, obscuring the necessary information from consumers. Furthermore, a label such as a link or QR code prevents individuals without access to a smartphone or the Internet to know the origins of their food. This would create unequal access to information, taking away knowledge of products from consumers without these technologies. On a different note, some groups think that labelling GM products will cause increased taboo over these crops, which haven’t been clearly deemed harmful to humans. These individuals believe that requiring these products to be labelled will decrease sales, negatively impacting the economy.

This law presents a few larger issues at hand. First, it brings up the idea of consumer rights, and what information should and shouldn’t be available to consumers. Second, it presents inequalities regarding access to information. Finally, it questions the power of government, and whether governments should impose restrictions and requirements on companies, and what are acceptable restrictions and requirements.

¹ <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2213453016300295>

²<https://www.ams.usda.gov/sites/default/files/media/Final%20Bill%20S764%20GMO%20Disclosure.pdf>

1. Should the government impose clearer labelling laws to increase visibility and access to information? Why or why not?
2. What rights do consumers have? What rights should they be given?
3. To what extent is it ethical to produce GM foods in the first place?
4. Are other nations obligated to pass labelling laws as well? Why or why not?
5. What obligations do food companies have to their consumers? To the government? To the environment?
6. Should access to GM and non-GM foods be equal for all individuals?

The Friendship Report

Claire Weadock, Saline High School Junior

Recently, the number of threats of gun violence at schools across the country has increased drastically. As a result, your school has decided to implement a new policy with the intention of decreasing the number of threats by preventing incidents before they occur. The new policy, called “Report and Protect,” states that you are required to report any students who have been acting suspiciously or are currently suffering from mental health issues. The school specifies that you must report these students, even if they are close friends of yours, but you are not required to disclose your reasons for reporting them. The policy also states that those who report can meet with an administrator about any concerns or can remain completely anonymous by simply texting a specified number. School administrators have said that these stipulations have been implemented in the interest of the reporting student and to make it easier and safer for students to come forward and report someone.

However, the student who is reported may face significant consequences. The policy notes that all reported students will be thoroughly examined for any signs that they pose a threat to themselves or others. If the examination finds that the student is a threat, he or she will be met with severe punishments including, but not limited to, suspension, expulsion, or possibly criminal charges. Even if nothing is found, the reported student may be required to meet with an outside counselor for an evaluation, which can induce unnecessary stress and anxiety.

You have a friend, Rachel, whom you have known for many years and consider your best friend. She is a straight A student, is a member of many community service and volunteering clubs, and has never been in trouble in or out of school. You are also aware that Rachel’s family often goes hunting and owns multiple guns. However, you have no reason to believe that this could be problematic. Recently though, she has been acting out of character, staying out late on school nights, not completing homework assignments, and missing many days of school. She chooses not to tell you why she has been acting strangely, and you struggle with the difficult decision of whether or not you should report her for acting suspiciously. She finally confides in you she was recently diagnosed with depression by a mental health professional, but only after you have promised that you won’t tell anyone.

The new school policy has been widely advertised, and according to it, you should report Rachel based on the fact that you know for certain that she suffers from mental health problems. However, you are torn. You know that you are the only one she has told about her recent diagnosis. Subsequently, if she is reported and investigated, she will most likely know that it was you, her close friend of many years who promised to keep her diagnosis private. Reporting her may have detrimental consequences for both of you, including the loss of friendship, which is important to both of you. Additionally, you are aware that reporting Rachel may cause excessive and unnecessary stress for her, as the policy states that all reported students will be evaluated by an outside counselor. On the other hand, the school policy has been implemented in order to prevent any possible dangers to students, including yourself.

Should you report Rachel? Why or why not?

Study Questions:

1. If you talk to Rachel about the policy, does it make it more acceptable to report her?
2. Is it acceptable to use your personal knowledge about a student to decide whether or not you should report him/her? What if he/she was likely to be dangerous?
3. Should you value your own well-being over the well-being of your friend of many years?
4. If the school changes the policy to require students to disclose the reasons for reporting a fellow student, would this change what you should do?
5. Are there any possible benefits for Rachel that come from reporting her?
6. Is the policy itself reasonable?

Disabled Athletes
Frank Seidl, Huron High School Senior

In the past, the lack of a limb posed an enormous obstacle to anyone trying to live a physically active life. People with missing or partial legs were unable to walk, let alone run, at great speeds or over long distances, and people without fully functioning arms and hands struggled with upper-body activities like carrying, throwing, and catching objects. Consequently, being competitive at almost any physical sport required fully functioning limbs.

Today however, the necessity of biological limbs seems to be decreasing. Cutting-edge prosthetic technologies combine complex computational modeling, high-tech synthetic materials, and sometimes even built-in electric motors to narrow the ability gap between the able and the disabled. Many sufferers of debilitating accidents and congenital defects have made significant improvements to their physical ability and thereby quality of life through the use of prosthetics, the most advanced of which are able to bend, grasp objects, and deliver sensory feedback like human appendages.

In addition to their utility in everyday life, modern prosthetics enable people with missing limbs to play certain sports. In the Paralympic Games, limb-deficient athletes compete alongside victims of other disabilities in 27 different summer and winter sports. The most famous Paralympic athlete, Oscar Pistorius, is a South African sprinter who runs on prosthetics in lieu of the congenitally deformed legs that were amputated below the knees when he was an infant. Pistorius competed in multiple Paralympics, but achieved the peak of his fame in 2012 when he became the first leg-amputee to sprint in the Olympics against fully able athletes. (Pistorius was convicted of murder in 2015, incidentally.)

Whether or not athletes with prosthetic limbs should be allowed to compete with four-limbed athletes is the subject of some controversy. Supporters of athletes like Pistorius claim that a ban on such technology would be a form of ableist prejudice. (Ableism refers to unfair discrimination or bias against people with disabilities.) They also emphasize the value of disabled athletes as inspirational figures for other people struggling with disabilities, showing that the challenges they face can be overcome. Opponents of prosthetically enhanced athletes assert out that prosthetics are unfair because they have the potential to be better than real limbs, possessing, among other positive attributes, immunity to fatigue and pain. They also worry that permitting prosthetics would leave rule makers no choice but to open the floodgates to all sorts of other enhancement technologies. These could include modern technologies like muscular steroids and blood-doping, as well as more dramatic future technologies like genetic modification and cybernetic implants.

Study questions:

1. Should athletes with artificial limbs be allowed to compete in the same events as athletes without artificial limbs? Why or why not?
2. What, if any, technological enhancements to the human body are allowable in sports? How can we differentiate between those that should and should not be allowed?

3. Is it a violation of a disabled person's rights to ban the technology on which they rely from a competition?
4. What is the purpose/value of large athletic competitions like the Olympics and the Paralympics?

<http://www.merckmanuals.com/home/special-subjects/limb-prosthetics/overview-of-limb-prosthetics> <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/scientists-debate-oscar-pistorius-prosthetic-legs-disqualify-him-olympics/>

Closed Campus Policy

Emily Mattson and Miguel Cisneros, Pioneer High School Junior and Senior

Hannah is the principal of a high school in Michigan. She is currently debating whether or not to implement a closed campus policy at her school, and she has met with many teachers, parents, and students who have strong feelings about the subject. Many high schools in the area and throughout the country enforce closed campus policies, which involve locking all entrances to the school during school hours and requiring students to stay on campus during lunch.

Hannah's high school has had an open campus policy, but a student recently hit a pedestrian during lunch, and now many parents and members of the community believe that something must be done to protect students and pedestrians.

Will, the father of a current student, feels that having a closed campus is necessary for the safety of students and that a closed campus is beneficial for attendance. He believes that having all doors locked will keep potential threats such as school shooters from entering. Additionally, he does not think that high school students are old enough to be able to manage their own time, and he believes that open campus policies will result in students consistently being late to the class directly following lunch and low attendance numbers throughout the entire day. He brings up Lincoln High School, which is a school in Denver, Colorado that implemented a closed campus policy for their ninth- and tenth-graders. After this policy went into effect, ninth-grade attendance rates improved from 83% to 91%, while tenth-grade attendance improved from 88% to 91%. He also argues that allowing students to leave during lunch could result in car accidents and other tragedies, as demonstrated with the incident at Hannah's school, since the students would not have any adult supervision. On February 19, 2013, four students from Brandeis High School were on their lunch break when they ran into a pickup truck while racing another car. Two of the students were killed, and he believes that the accident demonstrates the necessity for closed campus policies.

Nancy, the mother of a current student, advocates for open campus policies because she believes that closed campus policies are not allowing students to have independence and are creating a negative environment. Her son Gabriel has been late to school in the mornings due to weather, and then cannot get into the school because the doors are locked, which has caused him to be even more late to his class than he already would have been. Additionally, Nancy believes that high school students need opportunities to prove their reliability, and that open campus policies allow for students to be treated like the young adults that they are. Students are allowed to make their own decisions about where to eat, and they are forced to be responsible for their money and what they spend it on. Students will also be going to college in the future, and the transition from being high school students to college students is difficult for many. Open campus policies help ease the transition for students by allowing them to have some independence while still in high school. Nancy also notes that high school students can be a source of income for local businesses. A principal from Modoc County, California said that local businesses donate to

his school due to the number of students who purchase food from them during lunch and that having a closed campus policy would negatively impact his school's financial status.

Hannah is unsure about whether or not a closed campus policy would be the best idea for her students.

Study Questions:

1. Should Hannah implement a closed campus policy at her school or not?
2. Whose opinion should matter the most in this situation? The students' opinions? The teachers' opinions? What other parties should be considered?
3. Some schools have conditionally open campuses which allow students with high grades to leave campus during lunch, but not students with low grades or suspensions. Is it morally permissible for schools to allow some students to leave but not all?
4. Should parents have a say in how much freedom their children have while on school property?

Sources: http://www.phaionline.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/04/otm_open_campus_lunch.pdf
<https://www.denverpost.com/2007/03/04/closed-campus-best-for-some/>

<https://www.mysanantonio.com/news/education/article/In-accident-s-wake-open-campus-policies-4318174.php> <http://www.nytimes.com/1988/10/23/nyregion/schools-split-on-open-campus.html?pagewanted=all>

Backcountry Emergency

Frank Seidl, Huron High School Senior

Robert was backpacking on a wilderness trail in a Michigan state park when he spotted Audrey, who had fallen into a ravine to the side of the trail. He approached her, and when she did not respond to his calls to her, realized that she was only semiconscious, having received a severe blow to the head. He also noticed that blood was gushing at an alarming rate from a deep gash on her right leg. He deemed that these wounds were caused by her fall.

Robert tried to call 911, but couldn't get cell service so deep in the backcountry. He decided that because of his basic first-aid certification, he knew enough about urgent care to provide Audrey with immediate medical attention before going in search of a signal. He worried that Audrey was losing too much blood too rapidly, so he used some clothes from his backpack to apply a makeshift tourniquet. Once he was sure that the bleeding was under control, he left Audrey and ran back to the campsite where he had stayed the night before, where he knew he could get cell service. He met another hiker, Andrew, along the way, whom he instructed to stay with Audrey until his.

It took Robert over an hour to reach the campsite, and by the time he had called 911, and a team of paramedics had gotten out to Audrey's location, she had been sitting still in chilly fall weather with the tourniquet tightly wrapped around her leg for several hours. She had regained consciousness, but was badly hypothermic and incoherent, and Andrew had prevented her from removing the tourniquet, trusting Robert's alleged medical authority. However, when Audrey finally was seen by actual doctors, they informed Robert that her gash had not been deep enough to be life-threatening, and that the tourniquet, by reducing the blood flow to her leg, had killed the limb. She would have to have an above-the-knee leg amputation because of Robert's incompetence.

Now Audrey is suing Robert for the permanent handicap he has inflicted on her. Robert's negligent overconfidence has caused her to permanently lose a great deal of day-to-day functionality. It also prevented her from going to her job for several months, and caused her severe leg pain. Furthermore, it destroyed her the ability to engage in the recreational activities she most enjoys, hiking, skiing, and mountain biking. She and her lawyer argue that Robert owes her a debt for this damage, and are requesting a total of \$500,000.

Robert and his lawyer maintain that Robert shouldn't have to pay for Audrey's suffering. They say that Audrey should be grateful for Robert having the presence of mind to try to help her and to place the 911 call. If he had not been there to run for help, they point out, the paramedics would have arrived later, and Audrey's hypothermia symptoms could have worsened, perhaps even causing permanent damage. They add that Robert's health insurance has already paid for Audrey's amputation, prosthetic leg, and physical therapy, settling any debt that he owed her. Finally, they make the moral claim that Robert doesn't deserve to be punished for an making an innocent, well-intentioned mistake.

Study questions:

1. Should Robert be forced to pay Audrey any additional money?
2. How would your answer to question one change if Robert had not been first-aid certified? How would it change if he had been a nurse or doctor with an actual medical degree?
3. Was it reasonable of Robert to try to treat Audrey's wounds? In general, when, if ever, is it appropriate for non-experts to make medical decisions for others?
4. Is Andrew in any way culpable for obeying Robert's misguided orders?
5. Does the fact that Robert probably saved Audrey from more serious hypothermia in any way make up for his critical error in applying the tourniquet?

Antibiotics Case Study

Virgil Watkins, Huron High School Junior

In the past decade antibiotic resistance has grown significantly and is becoming a very serious issue. Antibiotic resistance is how infectious bacteria are becoming more and more resistant to many, or even all, of the antibiotics that humans use to kill them. Currently, there are 700,000 deaths globally each year due to antibiotic resistant strains of bacteria and that number is only expected to rise. One study from the U.K. says that the death toll could rise to 10 million annually by 2050. As a current lawmaker, you are now faced with a bill that would loosen the requirements for an antibiotic to be shelved, which would remove many antibiotics from that status.

A shelved antibiotic is an antibiotic that a doctor can't prescribe to someone that has a normal bacterial infection. For a doctor to prescribe an antibiotic that has been shelved it must be a severe case where normal antibiotics have been ineffective. Many new antibiotics that aren't variations of current antibiotics are usually shelved after they complete clinical testing. After being shelved an antibiotic can remain on this list for an indefinite amount of time. Colistin, for example, has been shelved for most of its existence since 1959.

Many people say that reducing the amount of new antibiotics that are shelved will only worsen the problem. They argue that by allowing more of these "last-resort" drugs to be freely used you are only decreasing the amount of time it takes for the bacteria to become resistant to these drugs. It's feared that if these drugs are unshelved they will be over prescribed like other antibiotics, which will quickly reduce their effectiveness and make many of these last-resort drugs ineffective against many strains of bacteria in a matter of years. Also, the FDA just recently banned the use of antibiotics in livestock to promote growth. This was seen as a huge step in slowing the growth of antibiotic resistant bacteria. So allowing more antibiotics to be unshelved would only be a step backward.

However, many people and companies also believe that reducing the amount of new antibiotics that are shelved will in fact help the antibiotic problem. They argue that with less drugs being shelved there would be more of an incentive for drug companies to produce more new antibiotics. Currently there are only 51 antibiotics being developed, with WHO saying that of these 51, only eight of these antibiotics are "innovative treatments that will add value to the current antibiotic treatment arsenal." They argue that by allowing more of these new drugs to be normally prescribed by doctors, pharmaceutical companies would have more incentive to create new antibiotics which pharmaceutical companies are in dire need of. Currently, it takes at least \$1 billion and 10-20 years to take a new antibiotic from its initial discovery to being ready for use. Another thing is that recently there have been a few cases where the bacteria was resistant to every antibiotic that is currently available, including the antibiotics that have been shelved. Making the need for an influx of new antibiotic drugs even greater.

Study Questions:

1. Should you or should you not vote for this bill?

2. To what extent do we need to prevent the use of antibiotics, should it be available only in serious cases of infection or should hand sanitizer with antibiotics still be ok?
3. Do pharmaceutical companies have a obligation to research and develop new antibiotics despite the current costs and small returns for doing so?
4. What amount of responsibility does the public have to fighting bacteria-resistant antibiotics?