

Re: Medical Ethics

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med/2004-10/2191.html>

From: SJ (sjiuannng_at_yahoo.com)

Date: 10/25/04

Date: 24 Oct 2004 17:39:48 -0700

"Edgar Svendsen" <solon013@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<yrEed.5986\$5i5.2426@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> "Keynes" <Keynes@earthlinkspam.net> wrote in message

> news:b74ln0pc2doj4pdlcdgq9jrckflg3n7n4a@4ax.com...

>> On Sat, 23 Oct 2004 16:41:07 GMT, "Edgar Svendsen"

>> <solon013@earthlink.net>

>> wrote:

>>

>>>A recent newsitem about a kidney transplant and a private website that
>>>promotes finding donors and donees outside the "official" organ transplant
>>>waiting list spawned a spate of articles about the ethics of private
>>>acquisition of body organs. Some, even most, medical ethicists seem to
>>>feel

>>>that private acquisition is wrong in that it denies equal access to needed
>>>transplant by the poor. This raises a larger issue; again many, if not
>>>most,

>>>medical ethicists, believe that ethics demands access for all to medical
>>>care in general.

>>>

>>>It seems to me that such a position goes directly counter to America's
>>>so-called free enterprise system. Nobody is arguing that everyone have
>>>equal

>>>access to other things, for example, property in Beverly Hills. Here,
>>>access

>>>is limited by wealth acquired within the free enterprise system and, since
>>>not everyone acquires the same amount of wealth, not everyone gets equal
>>>access to Beverly Hills property. Many see this as just and proper. Work
>>>hard and succeed and you can afford things that those who don't work hard
>>>can't afford, that's the general gist. So if you work hard and bank your
>>>money you can afford health care when you want it. Doesn't that seem like
>>>the American way?

>>>

>>>If there are some things that ought to be independent of the financial
>>>system, some things that people are entitled to regardless of their
>>>position

>>>or contribution to the economic system, what are they and who should
>>>insure

> >>that they get them? Food and shelter are two that some think everyone is
> >>entitled to, at some minimum level, and the various governments, Federal
> >>and
> >>local take the responsibility to assure that through various welfare
> >>programs. It is as if there were a philosophical principle that says there
> >>is a "floor", everyone has a right to a basic subsistence, but, above that
> >>floor it's economic competition. Although the "floor" is never defined
> >>very
> >>well, you can deduce approximately what it is by what the various welfare
> >>agencies provide.
> >>
> >>Is there such a "floor" for medical care? If so, who should have the
> >>responsibility to assure that everyone is provided for? In England and
> >>Canada the government does make that assumption and does take
> >>responsibility
> >>for the care at the 'floor' level. In America no organized group has
> >>responsibility to assure "floor" level access to medical care. As a
> >>philosophical principle, are they right and we wrong or are we right and
> >>they wrong?
> >>
> >>One could argue that one system or the other is more efficient at
> >>delivering
> >>health care, but that's a different argument altogether. That's about
> >>implementation details of a fundamental principle, I'm trying to find out
> >>what the fundamental principle is or ought to be. What is ethically right?
> >>
> >
> > Everyone is born poor and naked and dies poor and naked.
> > Basic humanity is evenly distributed to all comers. But in the
> > course of life there is predation that many consider ghastly.
> > The 'haves' live such a sheltered life that they can't begin to
> > think of the problems of the have nots who live in constant
> > hand to mouth insecurity and desperation.
> >
> > Should a person of means buy kidneys? Why would a person
> > want to? If one's own kidney needs replacing that's a problem.
> > But how can that problem be solved by buying someone else's
> > kidney? Remember, the problem is need of a kidney. If it's bad
> > for the rich person to feel such a lack, can it be good for the
> > poor person to feel the same lack after selling his kidney?
> > Does the social agreement of monetary influence allow one
> > morality for the rich and the opposite for the poor?
> > The rich think so.
> >
> > Possessions in this world are no more than social agreements.
> > No one has anything at all except by the tacit agreement that
> > nobody will take one's possessions away. Wealth is an artificial
> > adornment that ought not to confer godlike powers of dealing
> > life and death, particularly as wealth is never earned.
> > Inherited wealth is no personal virtue.
> >

> > *So called earned wealth is also a social mirage. Most of the greatest
> > benefactors of society, the dreamers, inventors, thinkers, and doers
> > never get much financial success. Those who have shaped western
> > society through the millenia had no patents or monopolies or royalties.*
> >
> > *It's only in commerce that profits and wealth are made, and that by
> > the exploitation of labor who can't be paid full value for their labor
> > because that would vanish all profits. The benefits of modern industrial
> > society are apparent, but the drawbacks are just considered the cost
> > of doing business. Labor is a commodity on a par with sand or lumber.
> > Humanity is not even a consideration. In the USA, man is for the
> > economy and not the economy for man. Society will pay for this mistake.*
> >
> > *The rich claim they work hard for their money, but in fact it's their
> > money
> > that works hard for them. Even if they put in long hours and great
> > efforts, so
> > do the vaster numbers of the poor, and much more reliably and vigorously,
> > but without the rewards of even basic sustenance.*
> >
> > *A society that confers great benefits on a few at the direct expense
> > of the many cannot be a moral or even a self sustaining society.
> > It must eventually fall due to the basic natural equality of people
> > that is subverted by unnatural social inequities. The arrogance
> > and unconcern of the powerful increases until it is unbearable.*
> >
> > *From a moral point of view, matters of life and death ought not
> > to depend on wealth. From a practical point of view, matters of
> > life and death ought not to depend on wealth either, because the
> > present advantages of wealth can only be sustained as long as
> > the poor can bear them, and not a minute longer.*
> >
> *We agree on morals. I disagree that the dissatisfaction of the poor will
> ever change society in a way that greatly reduces the inequities in it.
> When led by the scions of the wealthy, the poor have proven effective at
> destroying social structures. For whatever reason, the poor are nowhere
> near as good at setting up new societies that are actually effective in
> reducing the inequities engendered by wealth or political power. Given how
> education is doled out, I don't expect them to get better at it either.*
>
> *Ed*
>
> >
> >

I am a student in healthcare administration and medical ethics is one of the topics discussed. Decision is always hard to make in this kind of situation. Most important, the decision made is to save a life and not for another set of abuse that the organ and resources to transplant it goes wasted.

SJ