

The legalization of organ sales essay

[Economics](#), [Trade](#)



In MacKay's article "Organ Sales Will Save Lives" she offers compelling information which supports the claim that the buying and selling of organs is justified and should be regulated and legalized. MacKay points out that the current trade of organs through the black market is creating a dangerous and unsafe process where people of third world countries are potentially at risk of being unfairly treated and exploited.

According to her article, over 60,000 Americans alone are on the waiting list for a transplant with an average wait of 10 years (93). If the government were to regulate the process, the procedure would potentially save countless people desperately waiting for a donor, and the process would be completed more efficiently and proper safety measures would be taken. According to MacKay, the world is "run by money" and in such a case government involvement would also ensure a fair payment offered to donors so they are not wrongly treated like those in the third world countries selling through the black market. In her opinion people deserve the right to make decisions involving their own bodies (96). MacKay states that a living organ from a donor has the ability to last a lifetime, while that of a deceased organ may only last a decade (93).

In MacKay's article with the use of statistical information, and an emotional appeal she creates a strong argument to persuade readers that the legalization of Organ Sales will save countless lives. One form of evidence which MacKay uses to support her point is the targeting of her audience's emotions (pathos). An example of this type of evidence can be seen when MacKay states that patients are waiting desperately on waiting lists for a transplant that they may never live long enough to get (92). This type of

evidence is effective because they develop a deep connection with her audience and allow her to reach them on a relatable level where they can understand her point of view. In return this allows her to create a stronger trust with them.

While this evidence does have some strong points it might be questioned because she does not consider the morality of the situation, and the expected audience may feel that there is an ethical dilemma in selling your body. Another type of evidence which MacKay uses is relevant statistical facts and logical reasoning otherwise known as *logos*. Use of this evidence can be seen when MacKay points out a statistic from The New York Times Magazine that in the year 2000, 2, 583 Americans alone died waiting for a transplant, and roughly 50, 000 worldwide (93). This evidence is strong and persuasive because in an argument it is difficult to deny a fact. The evidence holds sufficient relevance to her argument, and the data is typical. Her fact comes from The New York Times Magazine, which is a well-known and credible source. Questions might be raised about this evidence because although the source is credible, it is from the year 2000, which possibly can be considered slightly inaccurate.

While MacKay may present some convincing evidence in favor of allowing organ sales Kahn and Delmonico also contend that it would create a professional patient/doctor conflict (179). Together using effective evidence from the American Journal of Transplantation, they point out that the focus could switch from the health and care of the patients to the potential profits to be made. This evidence is effective because it shows that the legalization

of organ sales will without a doubt create issues in the medical and transplant communities. Kahn and Delmonico also contend that it devalues human life, and undermines moral foundations (179). Their evidence is effective because they are well educated, hold exceptional positions in their fields, and use highly credible sources such as the Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal, and New York Times Magazine to back up their claims. Although MacKay provides compelling supporting evidence, it is not sufficient enough to prove that the legalization of organ sales would be fixed by a government regulated system, and Kahn and Delmonico offer stronger arguments that they cannot adequately control it due to the conflicts it creates with patients, and the ethical consequences involved with the selling of human organs.