

SYLLABUS
HONORS 4397
THE HOLOCAUST AND MEDICAL ETHICS
Spring Semester 2015
University of Houston
Time: MW 2.30-3.50 Place: MR17
Instructor: Dr. David Brenner
E-mail: dabrenner@uh.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Does the fact that Nazi doctors conducted experiments on human beings and that German medical scientists played a central role in perpetrating the Holocaust guarantee that doctors and other health-science professionals are practicing medicine more ethically today? If the best-trained physicians of the early twentieth century were capable of such transgressions, will those of the early twenty-first century be able to avoid a similar outcome?

We will begin by examining the Nazis' approach to "applied biology"—i.e., the practice of eugenics, sterilization, euthanasia, and research experiments conducted on inmates in concentration camps during World War II. From there, we will discuss other genocides and instances of mass violence from the standpoint of bioethics and human rights. Topics include the Milgram and Zimbardo/Stanford Prison obedience experiments, the Tuskegee syphilis experiment, and the conduct of research with human participants (from "informed consent" to the Belmont Report). In addition, we will explore the role of health professionals in recent controversies surrounding discrimination in health care delivery, genetic testing, the interrogation of enemy combatants, etc. Whenever possible, we will enrich our study of these topics by drawing on the expertise and resources of the world-famous Texas Medical Center as well as the Houston Museum District.

While this is officially an upper-level course with mature subject matter, it is open to all students who are willing to think critically and question their assumptions. It is therefore open to undergraduates at all levels, from freshmen to seniors. Moreover, membership in Honors College is *not* required. The course may be applied as credit toward the minor in Medicine & Society as well as other majors and minors (usually upon petition).

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

By the end of this course, you should be able to: write and speak competently about the relationships between the Holocaust and medical ethics; demonstrate analytical and critical skills when approaching the study of each; and understand better the broad range of the human experience as informed by disciplines in the humanities and social sciences.

REQUIRED TEXTS:

- Bergen, Doris L. *War and Genocide: A Concise History of the Holocaust*. Rowman & Littlefield. 2nd edition, 2009, paperback, ISBN: 978-0742557154. Please read/buy the 2nd edition ONLY; do NOT use the 1st ed.
- Waller, James E. *Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing*. Oxford University Press, 2nd edition, 2007, paperback, ISBN: 978-0195314564. Again: please read/buy the 2nd edition ONLY; do NOT use the 1st ed.
- *Multiple* required shorter readings, all of which are available on our Blackboard course website and referenced in the "Course Bibliography" below.

GRADING

Weekly quizzes 30% all but 2 will count Moderating class discussion: 10% 30 minutes per student

Class participation 15% "quality trumps quantity..." MIDTERM EXAM 10% takehome due mid-semester TERM PAPER ("research paper" in stages) 35% final draft due final week

Quizzes (30% of final grade)

Short (20-minute) quizzes will be given *at least once per week* over the materials you have been asked to prepare for class. If you complete the readings attentively and on time, these short quizzes should be easy for you. Your two lowest quiz grades will be dropped when calculating your average quiz grade. Since we only meet twice a week, there can be *no make-ups* of the quizzes.

Moderating Class Discussion (10% of final grade)

Research in pedagogy has demonstrated that when the purpose of a class is to develop higher-level critical-thinking skills and abilities, the *least effective* discussion is superior to most lectures. The craft of facilitating discussions is not only useful but possibly indispensable in making political, group, and even personal decisions. Your role of the discussion facilitator is to walk a fine line between *controlling the group* and *letting its members speak*. See also the evaluation rubric to be handed out in class and on Blackboard.

Class Participation (15% of final grade)

Active participation is essential in this course. It includes asking thoughtful questions, bringing up important ideas in class discussions, and listening to the ideas of others. It does not mean that *quantity* of one's contributions trumps their quality; the one who talks the most does not get the highest grade. (Nor is it a good idea to miss several classes then compensate for it by speaking more when one is present.) Rather, each of us should contribute to a positive learning environment in which each person helps to build a learning community. See also the evaluation rubric to be handed out in class and on Blackboard.

Midterm Exam (10% of final grade)

A short take-home essay exam will be assigned close to the middle of the semester. A study guide and samples will be provided in class and on Blackboard.

Term Paper (35% of final grade)

An evaluation rubric and multiple handouts will be provided in class and on Blackboard with more precise details on this assignment. In brief, students will submit a 2500-word research essay. However, the paper is limited to the critical review of two major secondary sources. Papers must be submitted on time will receive full credit whereas late papers will be lowered one-half of a complete letter grade for each day they are submitted past the due date; thus, a "B+" paper submitted one day after the due date will be lowered to a "B." If you think you will have problems with any aspect of writing, I highly recommend that you make an appointment at the University's Writing Center.

COURSE POLICIES**Attendance**

You are allowed only *one unexcused absence* in this course without any change to your final course grade. *However, your course grade will be lowered by one letter for every unexcused absence after the first one.* (So if you have *three* unexcused absences and your course grade is a "B," that grade will be lowered to a "D.")

Formal documentation *must* be provided for an absence to be *excused*, in accordance with university rules. Absences due to illness will only be excused with medical notice, for instance. In addition, absences due to special circumstances will only be excused *in advance* of the date you will be absent. Please also note that if you arrive fifteen minutes late to class, or if you leave fifteen minutes early from class, that may also count as an absence.

Cell-free and electronic-free environment

The use of cell phones or wireless electronics of any kind is generally not permitted in class. Use of your

cell phone or other wireless devices constitutes disruptive behavior, according to university policy. Some professors see it as disrespectful and suggesting that you are not serious about the class,

Disability

The University of Houston is committed to providing equal education opportunities for all students, and will make reasonable academic accommodations for students identified as disabled under the law. For more information, contact the Center for Students with Disabilities at 713-743-5400, or see their online explanation of policies and procedures at <http://www.uh.edu/csd/>.

Plagiarism and Academic Honesty

Plagiarism is an act of intellectual dishonesty that consists of passing off another’s words or ideas as one’s own. Sanctions for infractions of plagiarism are serious and may result in failing the course or being placed on academic probation. Whenever you use another person’s phrasing or thoughts--either as a quotation or as paraphrase--in your formal writing, be sure that you clearly acknowledge those sources.

Furthermore, papers written for another class should not be used to fulfill the requirements for this course. Using them will be considered an act of *academic dishonesty*. If you would like to incorporate fragments from a paper written for a different course, you need to obtain written authorization from the professor of that course and from me. If you do not comply with this regulation, you will face the penalties outlined above.

Extensions for Assignments

As a general rule, I only grant extensions for assignments in cases of genuine emergency or extreme circumstances. That means that written documentation must be provided to me via email. Put differently, lack of preparation on your part does not constitute grounds for receiving an extension.

Email Policy

You are encouraged to email me with any and all questions that you may have about the course materials or requirements. However, I do not respond to questions via the Blackboard course website or via text messaging.

If you miss class, it is your responsibility to find out from other students what was covered that day. Nor will I answer any emailed questions that ask about something that has already explained in the syllabus; please refer to the syllabus *first* and make sure your question is not already answered in it.

Disruptions and Violation of University Regulations

Disruptive behavior also includes *the use of cell phones or other electronic devices (e.g., laptops)* and leaving class before it ends. For the relevant university regulation, I refer you to the following statement from the on-line undergraduate catalog: *“Disruptive behavior includes the use of or the failure to deactivate cell phones, pagers, and other electronic devices likely to disrupt the classroom.”* Also consult the section of the *UH Student Handbook* entitled "Disciplinary Code," as well as the section of the online undergraduate catalog entitled "Maintaining a Learning Environment" (www.uh.edu/dos/publications/handbook.php).

COURSE SCHEDULE

DATE	ASSIGNMENTS DUE ON THAT DAY
WK1	Introduction to Course, Syllabus, Schedule, and Policies

Wed. Jan 21	Important diagnostic exercise: Freewrite at least 250 words on the following prompt: why do you think that you might/might not find yourself in circumstances where you were tempted to support those in power (in the government, in your company, etc.)
WK2 Mon, Jan. 26	Submit to Dr. Brenner (via email) your completed course questionnaire In-class screening of <i>Nazi Medicine: In the Shadow of the Reich</i> Quiz on Michael Cohen article
Wed. Jan. 28	Quiz on Alan Goodman article and Francis Collins article
WK 3 Mon. Feb. 2	Quiz on article by Volker Roelcke; and on statements of German Medical Association (on the Holocaust) and the American Anthropological Association (on "race") DUE: SIGN-UP FOR A DAY TO "MODERATE DISCUSSION"
Wed. Feb. 4	Quiz on Arthur Caplan article and Shankar Vedantam article _____ moderates discussion
WK 4 Mon. Feb. 9	Quiz on Bergen, Prefaces/Introduction and Ch1 (<i>War and Genocide: A Concise History</i> , 2 nd ed.) _____ moderates discussion
Wed. Feb. 11	Quiz on Bergen, Ch2 _____ moderates discussion
WK 5 Mon. Feb. 16	Quiz on Bergen, Ch3 _____ moderates discussion
Wed. Feb. 18	Quiz on Bergen, Ch4 _____ moderates discussion
WK 6 Mon. Feb. 23	Quiz on Bergen, Ch5 _____ moderates discussion
Wed. Feb. 25	Quiz on Bergen, Ch.6 _____ moderates discussion
WK 7 Mon., Mar.2	Quiz on Bergen, Ch7 _____ moderates discussion
Wed. Mar. 4	Quiz on Bergen, Ch8 and Conclusion/Epilogue _____ moderates discussion
WK 8 Mon. Mar. 9	Quiz on Waller's Forward, Preface, and Introduction _____ moderates discussion

Wed. Mar. 11	DUE MIDTERM EXAM via Turnitin link (on Blackboard)
Mar.	<i>SPRING BREAK</i>

4

16/18	
WK 9 Mon., Mar. 23	Waller, Ch1: "The Nature of Extraordinary Human Evil" _____ moderates discussion
Wed. Mar. 25	Waller, Ch2, "Killers by Conviction" _____ moderates discussion
WK 10 Mon. Mar. 30	Waller, Ch3, "The 'Mad Nazi'" _____ moderates discussion
Wed. Apr. 1	Waller, Ch4, "The Dead End of Demonization" _____ moderates discussion
WK 11 Mon. Apr. 6	Waller, Ch5, "Beyond Demonization" _____ moderates discussion DUE TERM PAPER Stage 1
Wed. Apr. 8	Waller, Ch6, "The Cultural Construction of Worldview" _____ moderates discussion
WK 12 Mon. Apr. 13	Waller, Ch7, "The Psychological Construction of the 'Other'" _____ moderates discussion DUE TERM PAPER Stage 2
Wed. Apr. 15	Waller, Ch.8: "The Social Construction of Cruelty" _____ moderates discussion
WK 13 Apr. 20	Waller, Ch. 9: "Conclusion/Postscript" _____ moderates discussion
Wed, Apr. 22	Read/View Dr. Brenner's PowerPoint Lecture on "character development" Quiz on Zimbardo, <i>The Lucifer Effect</i> (excerpt from final chapter) _____ moderates discussion
WK 14 Mon. Apr. 27	Hoberman, Ch1, <i>Black and Blue</i> , pp. 1-18 _____ moderates discussion DUE TERM PAPER Stage 3

Wed. Apr. 29	Hoberman, Ch2, <i>Black and Blue</i> , excerpt, pp. 19-29 Brody article _____ moderates discussion
WK 15 Mon, May 4	Wrap-up / Course Conclusion / Celebration / Class Photo
Wed, May 6	DUE TERM PAPER Stage 4 (i.e., FINAL DRAFT)
WK 16 Dec 8	FINAL EXAM WEEK/ GRADES DUE

5

IMPORTANT DETAILS ON ASSIGNMENTS

I. FOUR-STAGE Term Paper Assignment (35% of Course Grade in “Holocaust and Medical Ethics”)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: *Students are required to submit a 2500-word research paper, limited to the critical review of two major sources. Papers must be submitted on time to receive full credit. Late papers will be lowered one-third of a complete letter grade for each day they are submitted past the due date (thus, a “B+” paper submitted one day after the due date will be lowered to a “B”, a “B” paper that is two days late would merit a “C+,” and so forth). If you think you will have problems with any aspect of writing this paper, I strongly recommend that you make an appointment at the University’s Writing Center.*

STAGE 1) TERM PAPER TOPIC PROPOSAL (i.e., “POSING A GOOD RESEARCH QUESTION”): You will have to examine carefully your own interests within the subject area of “*Holocaust*” and/or “*medical ethics*” in order to come up with a research question that truly motivates *you personally* (and not necessarily *Brenner*)! At the same time, the question should not be too belief-based, too bland, or too broad – the latter implying that you can address the question in approximately 2500 words (circa 8-10 double-spaced and typed pages).

Hence, the “deliverable” – what you turn in for this first stage -- is a brief *statement* (using at least 2-3 complete sentences) of your provisional/working *research question*. There is no need to have a provisional/working *thesis* at all!

This RESEARCH QUESTION is DUE via email by APRIL 6th!

STAGE 2) SECONDARY SOURCES IN FULL: You may proceed to this stage only after I have approved of your stage 1 submission. Based on that research question and *some* preliminary reading and thinking (i.e. preferably *writing!*) about it, you will email me **COMPLETE COPIES OF AT LEAST TWO SECONDARY SOURCES closely related to that topic or argument**. These should be articles (or book chapters) that you have found using **online databases such as “JSTOR” or “PUBMED,”** both of which are available on the library website.

Unfortunately, you will probably *not* find two sources that address your topic perfectly. More significantly: 1) each of these sources should be from JSTOR or PUBMED; 2) all your sources should add up to at least 30 (THIRTY) pages total; 3) each single source should be no older than 1995 (nothing more than 20 years old!); and 4) each of them should be EMAILED to dabrenner@uh.edu IN THEIR FULL-TEXT FORM, preferably as a PDF file.

CAUTION: You need to email me a copy of the COMPLETE TEXT of the source--not just a URL, a link, or a citation! If you don’t provide these sources to me (your main reader), I might presume that you are lacking *ethos*, i.e., that you not serious about working like a reputable researcher. Rather, you need to “fight fair” (in scholarly terms) by showing me evidence for each of your claims.

THESE TWO OR MORE TERM PAPER SOURCES (i.e., at least two complete articles of at least 30 pages total) ARE DUE via email by APRIL 13th!

STAGE 3) Once I have approved your term paper sources, you should begin DRAFTING your term/research paper, the form/genre of which is a *critical review essay*. Your main objective in such an essay is to *analyze/review/evaluate* your two sources intensively/seriously. That means: you will be using the criteria (or “standards”) of humanities and/or ethics research in order to **give reasons why the sources represent good or bad research**. (Clearly, then, you are not writing an essay based on “personal opinion” or “advocacy.”)

The resulting rough draft – **of at least 1500 words** -- is consequently a type of analytical “book review” (what scholars call a “secondary literature review”). As you might guess, such a critical review essay is *not at all* your high-school “book report.” **You should thus at no point be simply summarizing the sources. Instead, you must at every point be analyzing them, critically and carefully.**

First, of course, you must **figure out each source’s thesis (main point)** –admittedly not a simple task.

6

Second, you must offer informed critique and/or appreciation of the methods, logic, and evidence found in each source, thereby showing that you understand how to write (and therefore think) like a scientist/scholar/researcher. You will need to *read and apply the directions* presented in the document on “The Structure of the Term Paper” (on the Blackboard in the “Term Paper” folder). **THIS ROUGH DRAFT (a minimum of 2000 words) IS DUE via email by APRIL 27th at the latest!**

STAGE 4) If I have approved stage 3 of your assignment, you may then proceed to THOROUGHLY revise your rough draft into a final draft. This fourth and final stage of the term paper assignment does not mean you must only correct some small issues (spelling, grammar, mechanics) and upload it to turnitin.com link. Instead, read carefully my advice/tips for final drafts, another document to be found within the “Term Paper” folder on the Blackboard course website.

Rather than just some micro-level changes, you should be *revising the rough draft significantly /globally/ radically*. Of course, at the same time you are *rethinking* the entire essay, you might also strive to make your individual sentences more **clear and concise** for the readers of your essay (who are not “mind readers,” after all).

THIS FINAL DRAFT OF THE TERM PAPER – which should be at least 2500 words--IS DUE via the course Blackboard website link to turnitin.com. THE DUE DATE to upload it is MAY 6th at the latest!

II. STRUCTURE OF TERM PAPER (i.e., CRITICAL REVIEW ESSAY, STAGE THREE):

SECTION ONE: Introductory paragraph (circa 250 words or so) must include

- your (final) research question
- a response as to why readers should truly care about your question. In other words, answer those who would ask “so what?” In other words, address the “significance” of that question.
- a road map/guide/preview of things to come. Put simply, *tell the readers what you are going to tell them*. Reveal the structure or organization of the rest of your paper (e.g. “I will review critically two recent secondary sources that broadly address this question”). Then, you should also include the authors and titles of each source (title enclosed in quotation marks, to also be cited appropriately in a “Works Cited” section at the end).

SECTION TWO: Body (approximately EIGHT) paragraphs (1000-1500 words or more): Your objective

here is TO ANALYZE EACH SOURCE INTENSIVELY IN APPROXIMATELY FOUR PARAGRAPHS. **Again, you should at no point be summarizing the sources.** Dr. Brenner will have read them, too, after all. **Instead, you must at every point be focused on analyzing them,** critically and carefully.

In the first paragraph on each source, you must **paraphrase each source's thesis (main point) in 50 words or less.** Distilling out that thesis and then condensing it in 50 words or less are necessary though admittedly not simple tasks.

In the next three paragraphs on each source, you must offer supported/informed **criticism and/or appreciation of the evidence, methods, and logic that support each source's thesis,** thereby showing that you understand how to write (and therefore *think*) like a scholar/researcher. **Your objective is not to agree or disagree with the thesis. Rather, you should be addressing THREE of the most relevant criteria (hence, three paragraphs) from among "Brenner's Top Ten Criteria for Analyzing Secondary Sources."** Those are the main criteria for seriously evaluating/analyzing each source's **evidence, methods, and logic.**

Here is a full explanation of these criteria (a.k.a. "Brenner's Top Ten Criteria for Analyzing Secondary Sources [summarized and borrowed from the best source]). This guide includes questions to ask while analyzing your sources. **In other words, to analyze each of the sources, you should probe / interrogate it**

7

based on the question(s) associated with each of the following criteria. (N.B. The UNDERLINED CRITERIA BELOW – NUMBERS 3, 4, and 9 – ARE THE MOST CHALLENGING AND THEREFORE *THE BEST* FOR YOU TO USE!)

1. Authority – Is the writer or publisher of the source credible and trustworthy? [ETHOS]
2. Representativity – Can similar information be found in other sources? Or, is this an isolated study, contradicted by many others? [LOGOS]
3. Accuracy – Is the information truly correct and/or based on reliable evidence? Can that information be verified in other (primary or secondary) sources? [LOGOS]
4. Objectivity–Was the research conducted according to the "scientific method," broadly defined? (In the experimental sciences, this means that the research makes excellent use of: control groups, double-blind procedures, large and diverse samples, longitudinal comparisons, etc.) Did the research have a "testable hypothesis" (like your "provisional thesis" for this essay)? Was the research "peer-reviewed"? [LOGOS]
5. Logic--Are there *any* logical errors or fallacies? For instance, are there any major contradictions (or sweeping or hasty generalizations)? [LOGOS]
6. Bias--Does the writer appear to make concessions to "the other side" (with or without rebutting them)? [ETHOS]
7. Documentation –Is there any indication that the author is not "fighting fairly" by failing to document his or her claims in a bibliography, footnotes/endnotes, or a list of works cited? [ETHOS]
8. Specificity and Detail – Is the information provided too general or too vague? Are any important details left out? Does the source contain evidence that is specific enough for the standards of research/analysis in that discipline? [LOGOS]
9. Sufficiency / Adequacy– Is the information based on sufficient data? Or, does the source seem to omit important information, i.e., evidence that a reasonable person could expect to be there? [LOGOS]
10. Currency / Topicality --When was the source's information acquired? Does the source provide any information that seems outdated? [LOGOS]

SECTION THREE: Concluding paragraph (circa 250 words or so):

- [USE THE FOLLOWING AS A TEMPLATE TO EXPAND UPON; FILL IN THE BLANKS WITH AT LEAST ONE CLAUSE]

My own view is that _____. Though I concede that _____, I still maintain that _____. Though some (e.g., the author of source one or the author of source two) might object that _____, I reply that _____. The issue/my question is ultimately significant because _____.

SECTION FOUR: A “WORKS CITED” SECTION, in which you provide the necessary bibliographical information for your two (hopefully not more than two) sources, according to MLA requirements. (MLA style/format for “Works Cited” lists can be found on the [Purdue University OWL website](#), among many other places). In quoting directly or paraphrasing your sources, follow the quote or paraphrase with the author of the source and page number(s) in parentheses.

8

III. COURSE BIBLIOGRAPHIES

REQUIRED READINGS

[in near-perfect MLA “Works Cited” format]

- Bergen, Doris L. *War and Genocide: A Concise History of the Holocaust*. 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2009. Print.
- Brody, Howard. [ONLY Chapter 8, “Race and Health Disparities”.] *The Future of Bioethics*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2009. Print.
- Browning, Christopher. “How Ordinary Germans Did It.” *New York Review of Books* 20 June 2013. Web.
- Caplan, Arthur L. “The Stain of Silence: Nazi Ethics and Bioethics.” Rubenfeld 83-92. Print. Cohen, M. M. Jr. “Overview of German, Nazi, and Holocaust Medicine.” *American Journal of Medical Genetics Part A* 152A (2010): 687–707. Web.
- Cohen, M. Michael, Jr. “Overview of German, Nazi, and Holocaust Medicine. *American Journal of Medical Genetics Part A* (2010): 152A: 687–707. Web.
- Collins, Francis “This Past Must not be Prologue.” Rubenfeld xix-xxi.
- Goodman, Alan. “Why Genes Don’t Count (for Racial Differences in Health). *American Journal of Public Health* 90.11 (November 2000): 1699-1702. Web.
- Hoberman, John. *Black and Blue: The Origins and Consequences of Medical Racism*. University of California Press, 2011. Print.
- Nazi Medicine: In the Shadow of the Reich*. Dir. John J. Michalczyk. 1997. DVD.
- Monroe, Kristen Renwick. “Cracking the Code of Genocide: The Moral Psychology of Rescuers, Bystanders, and Nazis during the Holocaust.” *Political Psychology* 29.5 (2008): 699-736. Web. Roelke, Volker. “Medicine during the Nazi Period: Historical Facts and Some Implications for Teaching Medical Ethics and Professionalism.” Rubenfeld 17-28.
- Rubenfeld, Sheldon, ed. *Medicine after the Holocaust: From the Master Race to the Human Genome and Beyond*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. Print.
- Vedantam, Shankar. “Why Mental Pictures Can Sway Your Moral Judgment.” *National Public Radio* 20 September 20, 2012. Web.
- Waller, James E. *Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing*. 2nd, rev. ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. Print.
- Zimbardo, Philip. [ONLY Ch. 16 “Resisting Situational Influences and Celebrating Heroism”.] *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil*. New York: Random House, 2007. Print.

HIGHLY RECOMMENDED READINGS

(e.g., for term papers)

- Aly, Götz, Peter Chroust, and Christian Pross. *Cleansing the Fatherland: Nazi Medicine and Racial Hygiene*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994. Print.
- Annas, George and Michael Grodin, eds. *The Nazi Doctors and the Nuremberg Code: Human Rights in Human Experimentation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992. Print.
- Barkan, Elazar. *The Retreat of Scientific Racism*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press: 1992. Print.
- Braun, Lundy, Anne Fausto-Sterling, Duana Fullwiley, Evelynn M. Hammonds, Alondra Nelson, and Susan Reverby. "Racial Categories in Medical Practice: How Useful Are They?" *PLoS Medicine* 4.9 (2007): e271, 1423-142. Web.
- Burleigh, Michael and Wolfgang Wippermann, *The Racial State: Germany 1933-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. Print.
- Frankfurter, Bernhard, and Susan E. Cernyak-Spatz. *The Meeting: An Auschwitz Survivor Confronts an SS Physician*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000. Print.
- Fredrickson, George M. *Racism: A Short History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003. Print.
- Friedlander, Henry. *The Origins of Nazi Genocide: From Euthanasia to the Final Solution*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995. Print.

9

- Goodman, Jordan, Anthony McElligot, and Lara Marks, eds., *Useful Bodies: Humans in the Service of Medical Science in the Twentieth Century*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003. Print.
- Kevles, Daniel J. and Leroy Hood, eds. *The Code of Codes: Scientific and Social Issues in the Human Genome Project*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992. Print.
- LaVeist, Thomas A. and Lydia A. Isaac, eds. *Race, Ethnicity, and Health: A Public Health Reader*. 2nd edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2012. Print.
- Lederer, Susan. *Subjected to Science: Human Experimentation in America Before the Second World War*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995. Print.
- Lewontin, R. C., *Biology as Ideology: The Doctrine of DNA*. New York: HarperPerennial, 1991. Print.
- Lewontin, R. C., Steven Rose and Leon J. Kamin. "IQ: the Rank Ordering of the World." Sandra Harding, ed., *The "Racial" Economy of Science: Toward a Democratic Future*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993: 142-160. Print.
- Lo, Bernard. *Resolving Ethical Dilemmas: A Guide for Physicians*, 4th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins, 2009. Print.
- Lombardo, Paul, ed. *A Century of Eugenics in America: From the Indiana Experiment to the Human Genome Era*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 2011. Print.
- Mosse, George L. *Toward the Final Solution: A History of European Racism*. New York: H. Fertig, 1978. Print.
- National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978. Web.
- Proctor, Robert N., *Racial Hygiene: Medicine under the Nazis*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988. Print.
- Reverby, Susan. *Examining Tuskegee: The Infamous Syphilis Study and Its Legacy*. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2013. Print.
- Weindling, Paul Julian. *Nazi Medicine and the Nuremberg Trials: From Medical War Crimes to Informed Consent*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. Print.

