

U N I T

5

**O R G A N
D O N A T I O N**

UNIT 5: ORGAN DONATION

The startling needs for organ transplants has resulted in the alarming global organ shortage. In the U.S. 100,000 patients are on the organ transplant waiting list. In the U.K. more than 10,000 people currently need a transplant. Of these, 1000 each year – that's three a day - will die waiting as there are not adequate organs. In Europe, 12 patients die every day because the waiting list is too long.

The organ drought has reportedly led to other serious problem like human trade, black market, human trafficking etc. The dire shortage of organs prompts states all over the world to devise strategies to help alleviate the crises. Different approaches administered in different countries have stirred up controversy and the organ shortage has essentially become one of the major bioethical issues.

This unit introduces you to two ideas proposed in curbing the desperate organ shortage situation.

1 BEFORE READING

- 1.1 Directions: Watch the organ donor advert clip at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tAlaAjUenDY> and discuss what you think of the issue.
- 1.2 Directions: Discuss the following with your partners.
 - 1.2.1 What would you do if a member of your family is terminally ill and there is no treatment but organ transplant? How far would you be willing to go? Would you buy an organ to save the life of your loved ones if allowed?
 - 1.2.2 Some Thai people believe that if they donate their organs, they will be born disabled in their next lives. What do you think of this belief?
 - 1.2.3 Have you designated yourself as an organ donor? Has the idea ever crossed your mind? Why did you do it? Why not?

2 THE MAIN TEXT

Directions: Read the following text on the donor organ system. Then, complete the exercises that follow.

VOCABULARY

Directions: Match the given meanings with the boldfaced words in the text.

✓ (n) task

- ✓ (adj) be constantly anxious
- ✓ (v) to control or influence someone or something cleverly
- ✓ (n) practice of selfless concern for others
- ✓ (n) ambiguity or inadequacy in law
- ✓ (n) product or raw materials that can be sold
- ✓ (adj) at the most advanced stage of something
- ✓ (v) to use rules or laws to get what you want in an unfair but legal way

A deadly organ donor system

Jeff Jacoby, Globe Columnist

Right on the heels of the recent news that Apple CEO Steve Jobs underwent a liver transplant came the speculation that he had somehow gamed the organ donation system in order to jump to the head of the waiting list. It was widely noted that Jobs' s transplant took place at a hospital in Tennessee, some 2,000 miles from his home in California. That suggests he had registered with more than one regional transplant center. Multiple registrations aren't against the rules but they can be an expensive **proposition**, since the patient must be able to travel at a moment's notice when the organ becomes available, and since insurance companies generally won't pay for evaluations at more than one hospital. Jobs, a billionaire, may thus have benefited, **frets USA Today**, from "a **loophole** that favors the rich." (1)

Had Jobs traveled to Tennessee to consult a highly sought-after medical specialist, or to acquire a piece of **cutting-edge** medical equipment, or to undergo a rare and difficult brain operation - or to buy a Smoky Mountains mansion, for that matter - nobody would be **grumbling** about loopholes or wondering whether rules had been **manipulated**. When it comes to doctors' services or medical technology or surgical procedures - or real estate - people understand that suppliers generally charge what the market will bear. (2)

The same economic system that generally makes good healthcare available to all does price certain products and services high enough that only the wealthy can afford them. It isn't news that the world's finest

surgeon commands a high fee, or that the latest "miracle" drugs tend to be expensive, or that billionaires can afford things that mere mortals can't. (3) Yet when it comes to the donation of human organs, countless people believe that the market must be prevented from **functioning**. (4)

Under current law, an organ may be transplanted to save a patient's life only if it was donated for free. Federal law makes it "unlawful for any person to knowingly acquire, receive, or otherwise transfer any human organ for valuable consideration for use in human transplantation." The surgeon who performed Jobs's liver transplant, the hepatologist who diagnosed him, the anesthesiologist who managed his pain, the nurse who assisted, the medical center that provided the facilities, the pharmacy that supplied his medications, even the driver who brought him to the hospital - all of them were paid for the benefits they

rendered. Only the organ donor (or the donor's family, if the liver came from a cadaver) could receive nothing except the satisfaction that comes from performing an act of kindness. (5)

That, many say, is as it should be: Organs should be donated out of goodness alone; otherwise the rich might exploit the poor. Others flatly oppose any hint of commerce in human organs. Opening the door to "financial incentives," declared the Institute of Medicine in 2006, could "lead people to view organs as **commodities** and diminish donations from **altruistic** motives." (6)

Unfortunately, altruistic motives aren't enough. I carry an organ donor card and think everyone should, but only 38 percent of licensed drivers have **designated** themselves as organ donors. Thousands of organs that could be used to save lives and restore health are lost each year, buried or **cremated** with bodies that will never need them again. (7)

No one would dream of suggesting that medical care is too vital or sacred to be treated as a commodity, or to be bought and sold like any other service. If the law prohibited any "valuable consideration" for healing the sick, the result would be far fewer doctors and far more sickness and death. (8)

The result of our misguided altruism-only organ donation system is much the same: too few organs and too much death. More than 100,000 Americans are currently on the national organ waiting list. Last year, 28,000 transplants were performed, but 49,000 new patients were added to the queue. As the list grows longer, the wait grows deadlier, and the shortage of available organs grows more acute. Last year, 6,600 people died while awaiting the kidney or liver or heart that could have kept them alive. Another 18 people will die today. And another 18 tomorrow. And another 18 every day, until Congress fixes the law that causes so many valuable organs to be wasted, and so many lives to be needlessly lost. (9)

2.1 COMPREHENSION CHECK

Directions: Briefly answer the following questions.

1 Why did Jobs travel to Tennessee?

2 According to the article, do the public think it's fair that the rich like Jobs afford certain goods and products that are priced outrageously? Why so?

3 Does the organ donation system work in the same way goods and services do? If not, how do they differ?

4 Why does the writer disagree with 'altruism-only' organ donor system?

5 What organ donor system does the writer propose?

2.2 DEVELOPING READING SKILLS

2.2.1 THE WRITER'S THESIS AND THE WRITER'S POINTS

As previously discussed in the Introductory Unit, the writer may, in his concluding section, presents his thesis. This text exhibits this technique. The writer sets out with the anecdote of the famous billionaire Steve Jobs' liver transplant. Then, he carries on with the opposing view and his refutation before wrapping up with his thesis.

1 What is the writer's thesis?

2 What is the writer's point?

P.	Structure	The writer's points
1	Introduction	Billionaire Steve Jobs' was criticised for _____ _____.
2-5	Body	Both the public and the law reject the idea of organ donors receiving a financial return for their parts.
6		The particular law exists to ensure that _____ _____ _____.
7		_____ _____ _____.
8		Medical care can be treated as a type of commodity and the organ donation system <u>should work in the same way</u> .
9	Conclusion	_____ _____.

2.2.2 IDENTIFYING THE TEXT STRUCTURE, THE WRITER'S ARGUMENTS AND THE WRITER'S REFUTATION

2.2.2.1 THE TEXT STRUCTURE

The text is structured in this way. First, in the introduction, to lead us to the story, the writer gives an account of a late famous billionaire Apple founder Steve Jobs, who was speculated to have manipulated the organ donor system in his favor. Then, in the body paragraphs, starting his arguments, he presents the opposing view, which holds that organs are unlike other goods or services and not subject to the same economic system that applies to goods and services. He goes on with the current altruism-only organ donor law. Here, the writer offers rationale behind this law and attacks the flaw of the altruism-only organ donor system. Finally, in the concluding paragraphs, the writer somewhat states his thesis and draws on the reader's sympathetic emotion.

2.2.2.2 THE WRITER'S ARGUMENTS

The writer's main argument centres around the idea that altruism-only notion doesn't respond to the growing need for organs. In addition, the writer also suggests that it is not sensible that while other parties receive compensation from their services rendered relating to organ transplant, the major party—the donor himself—is prohibited from receiving any compensation. Finally, drawing on analogy of medical care and organ donor system, the writer argues that if organ donors are to allow compensation like doctors do for their services, more lives can be saved in the same way there are less sickness.

2.2.2.3 THE WRITER'S REFUTATION

Let's analyse the writer's refutation.

What probably is the situation on organ donation?

_____ a There is a shortage of organs.

_____ b Few people have registered to designate their organs.

Our answer obviously is 'yes' to both alternatives. Now, let's see if we can identify the relationship between the ideas in a. and in b. The writer presents two facts so that he can attack the flaw of the current system *where people fail to register as donors and that leads to shortage of organs*.

Now use the information to fill in the writer's refutation column.

Rationale for 'donation out of kindness only' (P.5-6)	The writer's refutation (P.7)
If donations are made for valuable gain, the rich are able to take advantage of the poor.	_____
With financial incentives, people could view organs as commodities to buy and sell. Fewer people will donate organs out of kindness	_____ _____

2.2.3 IDENTIFYING THE WRITER'S PURPOSE

1 What is the writer's purpose in writing this text?

2 Why does the writer mention Billionaire Steve Jobs in his introduction? Tick your answer.

- a To point out that the poor have limited resources when it comes to social welfare
- b To point out that rich people like Jobs are able to game the system and get themselves organs sooner than normal people

3 ... but only 38 percent of licensed drivers have designated themselves as organ donors. (P.7)

What is the writer's purpose in the above statement?

2.2.4 THE WRITER'S ARGUMENTS AND INDUCTIVE/DEDUCTIVE REASONING

We are examining the line of reasoning again in this text. To recap, the inductive reasoning centres around the specific cases leading to the general conclusion, and the deductive reasoning builds on the general concept ruling the specific cases. In paragraphs 2-3, the writer talks about how the economic system works in governing the prices of commodities and services. Let's start piece by piece.

1 Price of goods and services

a MAJOR PREMISE

Luxurious goods and high-class services are highly priced.

b MINOR PREMISE

The world's finest surgeon provides a high-class service.

c CLAIM

The world's finest surgeon can command a high fee.

2 Now, we could use the information on the latest 'miracle' drug to formulate the logic in the blanks.

a MAJOR PREMISE: Special products are highly priced.

b MINOR PREMISE

c CLAIM

- 3 In P.5, the writer suggests the following ‘implicit’ claim. An implicit claim is a conclusion that isn’t explicitly spelled out but can logically be drawn from the major and minor premises. Fill in the major premise and the minor premise that lead to the writer’s claim.

a MAJOR PREMISE

b MINOR PREMISE

c CONCLUSION

Organ donors should also get paid (some valuable returns) for what (the organ) they have given.

2.2.5 MAKING INFERENCES

- 1 When the writer cites Billionaire Steve Jobs registering at many organ districts, allowing him to get his liver transplantation sooner than it could have been, what does the writer probably imply about the effectiveness of the current law on organ donation? (P.1)

- 2 Unfortunately, altruistic motives aren’t enough... (P.7)

What does the writer think is the cause of organ shortage?

- 3 ..., but only 38 percent of licensed drivers have designated themselves as organ donors. (P.7)

- a According to this information, is designating oneself as organ donor mandatory?

- b According to this information, what does the writer suggest as a solution to organ shortage?

- 4 If the law prohibited any “valuable consideration” for healing the sick, the result would be far fewer doctors and far more sickness and death. (P.8)

- a According to the above statement, are the sick able to seek medical care for free?

_____ (Hint: Study the use of this type of conditional clause)

b In reality, there are more doctors and not as much sickness. Why so?

5 The result of our misguided altruism-only organ donation system is much the same: too few organs and too much death. (P.9)

What point does the writer want to make in this analogy?

Hint: Find out what are being compared and why the writer uses 'the same'— healing the sick out of kindness and donating an organ out of kindness. Therefore, what the writer says is the result of our misguided kindness-only organ donor system would be the same as what could happen if financial gain were not allowed for healing the sick. Since it is not a desirable result, the writer in effect reiterates his thesis that altruism-only organ donation system should be repealed.

2.2.6 JUDGING EVIDENCE

Types	Y/ N	Where?	Which point is supported by this piece of information/evidence?	Sufficient and reliable?
Example 1) Facts	✓	<p>P.1 1) <u>Steve Jobs underwent a liver transplant in Tennessee, which is very far from his home state California.</u></p> <p>P.5 2) The law allows organ transplant only if it was donated for free.</p>	<p><u>The organ donor system has a loophole that may favor the rich.</u></p> <p><u>The law certifies the public's view of organ donation</u></p>	<p>Yes. It is a known incident which can be checked in any newspaper.</p> <p>Yes. The U.S. adopts the altruism-only organ donor system where one chooses to designate his organ without getting any valuable incentive.</p>

Types	Y/ N	Where?	Which point is supported by this piece of information/evidence?	Sufficient and reliable?
<p>2) Analogy</p> <p>In the first instance, the organ donation system is compared to the economic system that rules buying and selling of general goods and services.</p>	✓	<p>1) P. 2-P.4</p> <p>While the public accept the economic system, in which consumers are charged for goods or services that they are willing to pay, applies to most services, _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>(hint: what do the public think when it comes to organ donation?)</p>	<p>These two analogies support the same argument:</p> <p>The current out-of-kindness-only organ donation is a misguided idea and donors should receive some sort of valuable consideration too.</p>	<p>Open to discussion//</p> <p>Or No.</p> <p>In the first analogy, organ donation is a matter of life and death and if everyone's life is valued equally, organ donation which a person to live should not be priced.</p>
<p>3) Analogy</p> <p>In the second instance, the comparison has narrowed down to medical services, which is a much more similar idea to the issue at hand. The organ donation system is compared to the provision of medical services in which financial return is allowed.</p>	✓	<p>2) P.8-9</p> <p>It is unfair that medical services are considered a commodity that can be bought and sold in the same way as other services, yet organs are treated differently—_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>(hint: comparison of medical services with other commodities and organ donation with other commodities)</p>	<p>Same argument: The out-of-kindness-only current organ donation is a misguided idea and donors should receive some sort of valuable consideration too.</p>	<p>No. Organ acquisition or transplant cannot be regarded the same as other kinds of medical care. Whereas there are varied degrees of sickness and each patient can be treated differently depending on their financial resources, organ transplant is the last resort. Either the rich or the poor cannot seek alternative medication or treatment. Therefore, it is important that fair organ allocation must be ensured for every terminally ill patient.</p>

2.2.7 LOGICAL FALLACY

We could evaluate the writer's line of reasoning and see if he has committed a logical fallacy in his arguments.

In paragraph 8, the writer says

No one would dream of suggesting that medical care is too vital or sacred to be treated as a commodity or to be bought or sold like any other service.

Essentially, this premise implicitly leads to his claim that as with medical care, organs can be treated as a commodity to be bought or sold.

We've established previously that an argument is sound and valid if it follows the syllogism—the pattern of deductive reasoning—and the premise leads to logical conclusion. In other words, the truth of the premises guarantees the truth of the conclusion. Granted, this argument follows the syllogism, but we have to check if the premise is true. If the premise is, then the conclusion is true. However, is it really true that 'no one' would feel that medical care should be bought or sold? Could there be some of us who have strong view against this idea of medical care not free for all? Since the truth of the premise is not guaranteed, the conclusion could be held 'untrue'.

We can also analyse this argument from the point of analogical evidence. In this instance, the writer draws an analogy of medical care and organ donor system. However interesting the analogy seems, we should bear in mind medical care and organ donor system are basically different. And the two shall not be compared. In short, this analogy doesn't ring true. Why so? Let's imagine two patients—Somsri, a well-off business woman, is treated at a first-class private hospital for her Hep B, while Somwang, a daily-waged construction worker, goes to a run-down state hospital near his camp site for the same health problem. Our economic system allows two people to seek treatment affordable to them. Now, let's heat the situation up a notch. These two patients' illness is more serious than they thought. Both require a liver transplant. If our organ donor system allows Somsri to get a liver because she can definitely afford one, what hope does Somwang have? Will Somwang's wish ever be fulfilled? This imaginary situation illustrates why the analogical evidence the writer's offered to back up his view is not compelling.

Finally, we can argue that the writer has committed the Either-or fallacy. Either-or fallacy is when an argument is presented as if it were the only choice we have. In light of organ shortage, the writer offers his idea of 'treating organs like other goods or services by letting donors receive some sort of valuable gain' and ends his article by saying 'more will die each day' if the current organ donor law' is still in place. We certainly can appreciate the fact that people are dying and we need more donors. But the writer's offer is NOT the only option, and probably NOT a very sensible option either.

2.2.8 EXTRA FOCUS

2.2.8.1 INVERTED SENTENCE STRUCTURE

In this unit, we have experienced another challenge coming with uncommon sentences structures.

PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE + **COME, GO, EMERGE** ETC. + SUBJECT.

This structure is used when the focus of attention is at the subject, which is going to be further developed in the succeeding sentences.

Right on the heels of the recent news that Apple CEO Steve Jobs underwent a liver transplant came the speculation that he had somehow gamed the organ donation system in order to jump to the head of the waiting list. (P.1)

The focus of attention is part of the subject—the speculation. In the subsequent sentence we can see that the idea about Jobs underwent his liver transplant in Tennessee is further information about the speculation

The sentence can simply be paraphrased into:

Very soon after the news of Apple CEO Steve Jobs had a liver transplant operation, people speculated that he might have taken advantage of the organ donation system to become the first ones on the list.

2.2.8.2 Shortened Conditional Clauses

HAD + S + V3, S + WOULD HAVE V3

==> THIS IS THE PAST UNREAL CONDITIONAL CLAUSE.

==> IT SUGGESTS THAT THE REALITY IS TO THE CONTRARY OF THE STATEMENT.

Had Jobs traveled to Tennessee to consult a highly sought-after medical specialist, or to acquire a piece of cutting-edge medical equipment, or to undergo a rare and difficult brain operation - or to buy a Smoky Mountains mansion, for that matter - nobody would be grumbling about loopholes or wondering whether rules had been manipulated. When it comes to doctors' services or medical technology or surgical procedures - or real estate - people understand that suppliers generally charge what the market will bear. (P.2)

The past unreal conditional clause suggests that the reality is to the contrary of the statement. This is, however, the mixed unreal conditional clause (where the main clause suggests the present result, and the subordinate clause suggests its cause that happened in the past).

Facts:

1 Jobs did not travel to Tennessee to consult a highly sought-after medical specialist, nor to acquire..., nor to undergo ..., nor to buy ...(but he went to Tennessee to get a liver transplant)

2 People are grumbling about loopholes and wondering whether rules had been manipulated.

The possible paraphrased version is:

If Jobs had traveled to Tennessee to enjoy his privileges as a billionaire, no one would be bothered if he might have in some way manipulated the rules.

IF + S + V2, S + WOULD V 1: THIS IS THE PRESENT UNREAL CONDITIONAL CLAUSE.

==> IT SUGGESTS THAT THE REALITY IS TO THE CONTRARY OF THE STATEMENT.

If the law prohibited any "valuable consideration" for healing the sick, the result would be far fewer doctors and far more sickness and death. (P.8)

Facts:

1 The law doesn't prohibit any valuable consideration for healing the sick.

2 There are quite some physicians to heal the sick and there aren't as much sickness and death.

The possible paraphrased version is:

Because the law allows doctors to charge for their services rendered to the sick, there are doctors in practice and there are less sickness and death.

3 FURTHER READING

In the UK, another idea is proposed to respond to the growing disparity between the number of organ donors and the number of organs needed. This approach is called 'presumed consent'. The system has already been adopted in most European countries including Spain, Sweden, Luxembourg etc., yet it has not been a law in the UK. The following article supports this idea.

Directions: Match the given meanings with the boldfaced words in the text.

VOCABULARY

- ✓ (adj) the state of (a plan) successfully put into action and completed
- ✓ (adj) forcing or influencing someone to do something
- ✓ (n) the state where no one wants to do anything to change a situation
- ✓ (v) make something weaker or destroy it
- ✓ (n) strong negative reaction
- ✓ (n) a natural tendency to behave in a certain way

ORGAN DONATION: WHY WE SHOULD MOVE TO 'PRESUMED CONSENT'

The Observer

A majority of people say they are prepared to donate organs after their death, but fewer than half of these register. (1)

Inertia can be deadly. Around 65% of British people say they are prepared to donate an organ after their death – but only some 27% are registered donors. (2)

Meanwhile, 8,067 patients are on waiting lists for organs that could save their lives. They dwell, in the words of Frank Deasy, "on their own, invisible, death row". Their survival depends on closing the gap between people's willingness to donate in theory, and registering that intent in practice. (3)

Around 1,000 people every year die for want of transplant surgery. While the number of registered donors has more than doubled in recent years, from 8 million in 2001 to 16.45 million today, the increase has not kept pace with lengthening waiting lists. Something is needed to transform the culture of organ donation in Britain. (4)

The Observer has campaigned for one such change – the move to "presumed consent". Instead of relying on people to volunteer, registration would be automatic, but with an easy opt-out. (5)

Under this system, families would still be entitled to prior consultation, and have a right to refuse. There would not – and must never – be any hint of **compulsion**. The crucial difference would be the inclusion, in a single act, of that substantial majority of people who would be donors, but fail to register. The inertia gap would be closed. (6)

That fundamental difference in emphasis is in place in nearly all countries where there are high levels of donation. Britain has one of the lowest rates in Europe. This alone is not accountable for the difference, but there can be little doubt it helps enormously. The move would be controversial for sure. (7)

Indeed, fear of an anti-donation **backlash** is one reason why the Organ Donation Taskforce – the government body set up to consider ways to increase registration – chose last year not to recommend dramatic changes to the current arrangements. It feared vociferous lobbying against presumed consent would **corrode** wider support for organ donation in general. The taskforce was swayed by some healthcare professionals who feared public trust in them might be harmed if it was felt – however mistakenly – that the prospect of "harvesting" organs might be a factor in treating some seriously ill patients. (8)

Those are pessimistic arguments indeed. They assume the public's **propensity** to mistrust doctors is extreme and irreversible, and that a concerted campaign by the minority opposed to donation on principle would easily convince the large majority who are in favour. The opposite might also be true. The taskforce found in its fact-finding missions that exposure to all arguments, for and against, often won people round to presumed consent. (9)

The taskforce said it believed existing measures to raise awareness and encourage registration have not yet come to **fruition**. Hence it **counselled** caution. Wait and see. But as Frank Deasy's case shows, among thousands of others, waiting is the problem. (10)

The case for presumed consent has not been defeated – it has hardly been made. It was simply deferred in the hope the problem can be solved without a controversial public debate. (11)

The fact is that it takes such a debate – impassioned, persistent – to raise awareness to a level that might snap us all out of our deadly inertia. (12)

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2009/sep/13/organ-donation-presumed-consent>

Background:

Frank Deasy: Irish TV scriptwriter and Emmy Award winner who suffered from liver cancer and died at the age of 49 while on the list of liver transplant patients. He appeared on radio interview after this article was published requesting people to donate their organs after their death. The number of organ donor registration surged by at least 5,500, 2,000 and 3,500 the following days. After his death on 17 September 2009, it was reported that the figures rose to 10,000.

Terms relating to the topic

- ✓ Allocation—The process of determining how organs are distributed
- ✓ Brain Death—Brain death occurs when the brain is totally and irreversibly non-functional. Brain death is caused by not enough blood supply of oxygen which causes the brain cells to die
- ✓ Candidate—A patient who has been placed on the National Waiting List for solid organ transplantation

3.1 COMPREHENDING THE TEXT

1 What organ donation system does *the Observer* campaign for?

2 How does the 'presumed consent' work?

3 Why didn't the Organ Donation Taskforce decide to go through with the presumed consent idea? (P.8)

a They fear that those who strongly oppose the presumed consent will also be against the plan they are set to launch

b _____

4 They assume the public's propensity to mistrust doctors is extreme and irreversible, and that a concerted campaign by the minority opposed to donation on principle would easily convince the large majority who are in favour. The opposite might also be true. (P.9)

What does the opposite refer to?

5 According to P.10, why does the taskforce decide to 'wait and see'?

6 Why might the writer disagree with the task force's take?

3.2 DEVELOPING READING SKILLS

3.2.1 THE WRITER'S THESIS AND THE WRITER'S POINTS

1 What is the writer's thesis?

2 What is the writer's point?

P.	Structure	The writer's points
1-4	Introduction	The writer sets out by presenting a fact about the issue. One of the problems with organ shortage is that even though most people are willing to donate their organs, very few of them have signed up as organ donors.
5-6	Body	The move to 'presumed consent' should solve the problem.

7	Conclusion	Examples of countries with higher number of organ donation prove 'presumed consent' a successful measure.
8		Two reasons why the Organ Donation Taskforce is reluctant about give a go on 'presumed consent': 1 They fear of public anti-donation backlash on 'presumed consent' will damage the on-going organ donation campaigns. 2 They were swayed by health-care personnel fears in losing the public trust.
9		The writer refutes such negative views, maintaining that the opponents are too pessimistic and calls for open and thorough talks to win the public support.
10-11		The writer emphasises the urgency of the matter and encourages comprehensive discussion on the presumed consent measure.
12		The writer reiterates that the number of organ donation will surge under the presumed consent system.

3.2.2 RECOGNISING METAPHOR

- 1 They dwell, in the words of Frank Deasy, "on their own, invisible, death row". (P.2)

What word in the above sentence is used metaphorically? Explain what is the word compared to and why. (You may look the unknown words up in a dictionary).

3.3 EXTRA FOCUSES

3.3.1 PARAPHRASING

- 1 Inertia can be deadly. (P.2)

- 2 The inertia gap would be closed. (P.5)

- 3 That fundamental difference in emphasis is in place in nearly all countries where there are high levels of donation. (P.7) Hint: What may contribute to higher levels of organ donations in other European countries?
-
-

3.3.2 RECOGNISING LEXICAL COHESION

We could take note of the way the writer ‘weaves’ together parts of the text. The same ideas are conveyed through varied phrases across sentences and across paragraphs. Recognising this use of ‘lexical cohesion’ helps better our reading of the text. Lexical comes from ‘lexis’ which means ‘words’. ‘Cohesion’ refers to the way parts of the text are woven together creating a unified string of information. It can be achieved through such devices as connecting words, pronoun referents and also through words of the similar meaning. This, however, is not only limited to synonymous words defined by dictionaries but also words or phrases that the writer carefully chooses to convey the same idea in that particular context. Let’s examine the word play the writer’s employed in this text.

- 1 *A majority of people say they are prepared to donate organs after their death, but fewer than half of these register.* (P.1)

Inertia can be deadly. (P.2)

What word connects the idea in P.1 with P.2? What idea does the word mean?

- 2 *Their survival depends on closing the gap between people's willingness to donate in theory, and registering that intent in practice.* (P.3)

What are the two words that are used synonymously in this context?

- 3 *Something is needed to transform the culture of organ donation in Britain.* (P.4)

The Observer has campaigned for one such change – the move to "presumed consent". (P.5)

What are the two synonymous words in this context?

In this text, the writer uses *transform* in P.4 then he uses *change* in P.5 to continue talking about the same topic that is the new proposal to increase the registration of donors.

3.2.3 WORD REPETITION

Another way of connecting the ideas in the text is to repeat words.

- 1 *That fundamental difference in emphasis is in place in nearly all countries where there are high levels of donation. (P.7)*

What difference is being discussed?

In order to answer this question, we need to revisit paragraph 6.

Under this system, families would still be entitled to prior consultation, and have a right to refuse. There would not – and must never – be any hint of compulsion. The crucial difference would be the inclusion, in a single act, of that substantial majority of people who would be donors, but fail to register. The inertia gap would be closed. (P.6)

Now, you should be able to come up with the complete idea of the phrase in question. The difference of this system is that it would include _____

- 2 It was simply deferred in the hope the problem can be solved without a controversial public debate. (P.11)

The fact is that it takes such a debate – impassioned, persistent – to raise awareness to a level that might snap us all out of our deadly inertia. (P.12)

What word is repeated?

What kind of discussion does the writer think is needed in P.12?

The earnest and purposeful debate as to the pros and cons of the presumed consent proposal which will expose the public to the idea and hopefully will wake them up from inertia.

4 WRITING A SUMMARY

Directions: Summarise the text 'A Deadly organ donor system' by filling in the blanks provided with appropriated ideas. In this article you can see that the order of information presented in the article does not much correspond to the previously suggested steps for writing a summary. The writer sets out his body paragraphs by addressing the opposing view, the reason behind the current altruism of organ donation system, rather than presenting his arguments from the beginning. This is aimed at pointing out flaw of the system in place and using this concession to support his own arguments in favour of organ donor compensation.

Use the new frame provided and fill in the blanks.

(1) Title

(2) The writer's name

- (3) Opposing view(s)
- (4) The writer's arguments
- (5) The writer's thesis
- (6) The writer's conclusion

In (1) 'A Deadly Organ Donor System', (2) Jeff Jacoby argues that (3) organ donors should be allowed compensation for their organs. Firstly, the writer recounts Steve Jobs' liver transplant in Tennessee. Apple CEO billionaire was criticised to have possibly manipulated the law on organ donation by registering at many organ transplant centers. Jacoby addresses the reason for such resistance by pointing out that although people generally accept the law of economics where prices of goods and services are set at the satisfaction of sellers and buyers, they do not view organ donation in the same way. To many people, (4) treating organs like products and services will allow the rich to exploit the poor and fewer people will consider donating their organs after their death purely out of kindness. The writer attacks such idea, which is certified by the federal law, by (5) providing statistics to show that the system of donation out of kindness alone cannot encourage people to become organ donors and that means there are not adequate organs for the sick who await organ transplant. He then draws an analogy of organ donation and medical care for the sick. Since doctors are able to charge for the services rendered to the sick, there are not as much sickness and death. Organ donation should be viewed the same way. In conclusion, Jacoby emphasises his position that (6) organs can be treated like any other kind of products and services so that many more valuable lives will be saved.

Now, summarise the text *Organ Donation: Why we should Move to 'Presumed Consent'*.

5 WRITING A JOURNAL

Directions: Pick one of the following activities and write a one-page reflection on the issue you've chosen.

- 1 Discuss potential problems that could result from the organ donor system proposed in '*The Deadly Organ Donor System*'. Provide workable 'incentives' that you think could boost up the number of organ donors.
- 2 Iran is the only country in the world that legally allows selling of a kidney. Yet no countries have followed suit. Do some research on the situation of organ trade in this country.
- 3 Do some research on innovative approaches to increase organ donors that are being discussed in different countries.
- 4 Watch Grey's Anatomy Season 5 Sympathy for the Devil and write if you agree with Dr. Shepherd's or Dr. Grey's decision.
- 5 Find two VDO clips on Organ Donation and share them in class. Explain why you think they are powerful in conveying the message

Useful references

<https://organdonor.gov/statistics-stories/statistics.html>