Gene Technology and Social Acceptance


Over the past 15 years, since the publication of Walter Bodmer’s report for the Royal Society, the public understanding of science (PUS) has become a positive industry in the UK. Initially intended by the natural scientists to foster public acceptance of science, it has gradually drawn on a longer and deeper academic tradition in Britain of the social studies of science. Some of that social science research predicted the recent “moral panic” over genetically modified (GM) crops and food, but both natural scientists and governments have held social science in low esteem for many years, so it went unremarked at the time.

The hypothesis of those who launched PUS was that the public was merely deficient in factual knowledge and that public acceptance of science could be improved simply by setting out “the facts”. Social studies of science had demonstrated the vacuity of this “deficit model”, both theoretically and empirically, long before the GM furore provided an experimental falsification of the hypothesis that was evident to all. With the publication of a seminal House of Lords report on science and society in 2000, a more socially informed way of thinking is now entering the British mainstream.

This book offers a view from a rather different perspective: it is neither British nor a work of social scientists, but comes from the head of a nuclear power plant or to burn coal; to slaughter a nation’s cattle herds or hope that BSE will not transmit to humans, to plant GM crops. Although we accept socially imposed technological risks—indeed it would be impossible to live in a society if we did not—that acceptance is provisional and will turn to rejection if anything goes wrong. The character of risk changes from premodern to modern society: one does not sue God for a natural disaster, but we believe it justifiable to sue if a train crashes, or an aeroplane falls from the sky.

Socially imposed technological risks are a central, defining element of life in modern society, not a secondary “emotional” factor. Strangely, although the fundamental text that sets out this thesis on risk—The Risk Society—was originally published in German by a German sociologist, Ulrich Beck, it appears in translation only in the UK. It has been elaborated in the UK by Anthony Giddens, now director of the London School of Economics, but he appears not to be cited either. Despite its flaws, there is a great deal in this book. It attempts a “big picture” overview, and much of its factual and historical content is interesting and valuable. The authors provide a clear exposition of the technical aspects of biotechnology itself and do appreciate many of the social and ethical issues that it raises. It seems to represent a genuine attempt to reach out from the laager of technological supremacists to the wider community to seek consultation and consensus. As such it is to be welcomed, for no purpose is to be served by repeating, with genetic modification, the mistakes of nuclear power. But for all that, this book also shows just how far there is for the scientific-industrial community still to go before it fully appreciates the rational foundations for the public to assert its voice, its values, and its expertise, as well as, and against, the well-articulated voice, values, and expertise of the biotechnology companies.

Medical Ethics: Sources of Catholic Teaching


This third edition of O’Rourke and Boyle’s Medical Ethics: Sources of Catholic Teaching is a useful and comprehensive collection of statement and consensus. It provides a ‘big picture’ overview, and much of its factual and historical content is interesting and valuable. The authors provide a clear exposition of the technical aspects of biotechnology itself and do appreciate many of the social and ethical issues that it raises. It seems to represent a genuine attempt to reach out from the laager of technological supremacists to the wider community to seek consultation and consensus. As such it is to be welcomed, for no purpose is to be served by repeating, with genetic modification, the mistakes of nuclear power. But for all that, this book also shows just how far there is for the scientific-industrial community still to go before it fully appreciates the rational foundations for the public to assert its voice, its values, and its expertise, as well as, and against, the well-articulated voice, values, and expertise of the biotechnology companies.

The Ethics of Clinical Research in Developing Countries


The discussion paper produced and published by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics about the ethics of clinical research in developing countries is a timely, useful and (for such a concise publication) comprehensive document. It will prove useful for those planning research in developing countries, as well as for those already working in the developing world and planning research. The sponsors of research should also read the paper, whether they are pharmaceutical companies or a host country’s statutory bodies, reviewing research proposals. The topic has most recently been discussed in the context of the controversy surrounding trials of zidovudine (AZT), but the authors rightly point to a much wider agenda. They also convincingly highlight the differences and difficulties that are particular to research by developed countries in developing countries (rather than those inherent in all research). They also touch, however, on the issue of self-governed research in the developing world.

Perhaps the general issue can most easily be summarised in terms of the competing arguments for universality in the ethics covering research (which can be broadly described as paternalism from the developed world), and for acknowledging the need for local self-determination (which can be seen as condoning unethical behaviour). Taken to the extreme the “Universal School” may result in no potentially useful research being done in the developed world because of the fear of any harm. The local self-determination group can, however, fall into the dangers inherent in having varying standards and therefore lead
to the developing world being exploited by the richer and more powerful North.

More broadly, it is possible to see this branch of ethics as a subset of the overall ethics associated with development, underdevelopment and poverty. Many of the special dilemmas of trials of HIV preventive vaccines are compounded by the different appropriate standards of care arise directly from poverty and inequality. For example, those who argue for developed world standards of care for all trial participants, will need to ask if this medical care should continue to be provided, even when the underlying cause of the condition is malnutrition. Should one then provide developed world standards of food, thus compromising the economics of the infrastructure and the trial?

The paper covers the existing guidance and the dilemmas, contradictions, and problems they pose in their application. It also covers the issues of non-therapeutic research, concern and concern for those who remain after a trial is over.

Not surprisingly in such a paper, there are more questions than answers. The authors do, however, point to one very good example of prudence in the guidance that the guidelines can provide. This is where pro-active guidance (unfortunately provisional and therefore un-referenced) is being provided in the form of a document on ethical considerations in international trials of HIV/AIDS preventive vaccines by the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). Perhaps the future lies in the production of appropriate intermediate guidance and training, in a minimum set of ethical issues and practical considerations that should be addressed before research is started. This may enable a compromise to be reached between some of the impracticalities and the need in applying developed world standards and developing universal standards. This paper is a very useful start in identifying the issues and indicating a way forward.

A P Bacon

The Ethics of Health Care Rationing: Principles and Practices


This book is about scarcity and rationing in health care and the ethical questions they raise. It is based on the premise that if the aim of a responsible government is to balance the nation’s varied claims upon the collective purse, then no government can be morally blamed for failing to remove the need of rationing from the National Health Service (NHS), and thus rationing as such cannot give rise to legitimate moral concerns. The question that needs to be addressed therefore is not whether rationing itself is unethical, or even whether any particular distribution of medical resources is unethical, but whether they are structured and work in morally acceptable ways, and lead to morally acceptable results.

In the first chapter Butler describes the gap between needs and resources. He describes what has been done (mainly) in the UK as a way of providing the background to the rationing debate. The second chapter addresses the moral basis of rationing by focusing on the principle that personal qualities we are prepared to accept as a fair basis for discriminating between individual patients. The author could not have chosen a simpler and yet more effective example to drive us through the debate.

Chapters 3 to 5 tackle the debate on rationing from a different point of view. Here Butler explores the moral issues of fairness and justice through the structures, processes, and outcomes of health care. Given that health services will always be in short supply in relation to potential demand, he asks whether they are structured and organised in ways that will promote people’s fair and equitable access to health care. This question is addressed by taking the reader through three competing theories of justice: those of Rawls (social justice), Daniels (fair equality and opportunity), and Doyal (human need). All three share a common feature in highlighting that the structure and organisation of health care cannot be left to chance or interest but must be planned and implemented in ways that make explicit the principle of justice they are seeking to achieve.

Butler then takes the reader through the various processes of health care. Starting with a description of Waele’s theory of responsible or responsive government, he presents numerous arguments, examples of implicit and explicit rationing, public involvement in, and political and professional accountability for, rationing decisions, pointing out the potential conflicts between different moral concerns at different levels. Clinicians have a primary obligation to treat the individual patients before them, managers to see that public resources are not wasted, and politicians to use resources fairly and to balance interests and expectations of different sections of society. Within a given budget constraint, are government and health authority decisions made on the basis of defendable ethical criteria? Even when that doctors and nurses are unable to do all they would like to do for their patients, are they making choices based on established ethical criteria?

Chapter 5 addresses the ethical issues of health care rationing and health outcomes. As Butler states, outcomes are elusive things. Even at the patient level measuring improvements in health may be tricky, but at population level, where ethical questions are more likely to be posed, the difficulties multiply. Moreover, improvements in health are likely to reflect a variety of social, economic, environmental, educational, and occupational changes among which delivery of care is only one. In situations where all objectives cannot be achieved and comparisons between different outcomes have to be made, how can we fairly establish what some objectives are morally to be preferred to others? Should outcomes be perceived in terms of meeting individual need, the maximisation of total health gain (utilitarianism for example, using quality adjusted life years) or as the narrowing of the health gap between rich and poor?

Chapter 6 singles out this book from others on the topic. This chapter contains a series of stories the author has gathered from professionals who deliver health care. In order to present an unbiased selection of stories, Butler’s includes anecdotes from doctors, clinicians, nurses, and managers. Despite their differences, these stories contain a common thread in that although none say so openly, each clearly describes a decision which implies rationing. These stories clearly bring out the conflict between moral concerns at the different levels.

From a professional point of view this book has much to offer both to those familiar with the subject and to those new to it. Moreover, although the book is mainly concerned with the UK what it has to say can apply equally to other countries, particularly other countries in Europe. Overall this book is comprehensive, thought-provoking, readable, and highly recommended.

M Longo

Speaking for the Dead: Cadavers in Biology and Medicine


This book is well-timed. Jones has produced a broad-ranging work focused on a novel subject: the cadaver. In this year alone, high-profile media issues have included the non-consensual storage of postmortem examination tissues at Alder Hey; the trial of Dr Heinrich Gross, for killing and storing the brains of children in Austria in the second world war; debate about the medical uses of forensic and veterinary specimens; and the removal of the burial of indigenous remains from museums.

Speaking for the Dead is underpinned by a profound respect for cadavers. Jones makes the claim that respect accorded to persons (and their wishes) extends to their tissue after death. He bases this on both utilitarian and Kantian grounds. Hypothetical arguments—such as that of the “neomort”—flesh out the argument.

Historical examination of attitudes to cadavers provides a context for this work. It is brave and noteworthy to describe explicitly our fearful subjective response to dead bodies. I would unreservedly recommend this chapter alone to medical students commencing dissection. It is a humanising explanation of the heritage and necessity of undertaking post-mortem examination and of learning anatomy by dissection.

Jones then advances another strong contention: that the use of unethical research data and results constitutes moral complicity. He discusses contentious research derived from autopsies and wartime experiments, as well as touching on legal issues such as whether the body and its parts can be regarded as property.

The response to indigenous concerns about archaeological findings is also thoughtful. Jones manages to balance, on the one hand, strong arguments for advancing knowledge in science and anthropology, and on the other, the interests of indigenous peoples in respecting ancestors.

The discussion of organ transplantation policies and the incipient ethical dilemmas of new technologies is generally solid, but occasionally fails to accommodate the full range of opinions. Given the broad remit of the field, Jones does well to cover the many hypothetical situations which may be expected.

In discussing brain death, Speaking for the Dead reintroduces the perspective of the cadaver, the person he or she was previously, and other stakeholders. These viewpoints, in defining brain death, frequently become subsumed to technical neurology and philosophical argument about personhood, selfhood and consciousness. Jones makes more action guiding points, and thus his discussion is more clinically relevant than most other debates about brain death.

Finally, Jones expounds on his particular expertise, embryology, and specifically addresses brain birth. His arguments are based upon careful study and are highly pertinent. I hope they will be heeded.

www.jmedethics.com
The American Medical Ethics Revolution


Codified moral medicine is an antidote to making the profession wallow in the morass of moral idolatry, and a rampart that should be strengthened continually, rather than dismantled. The notion of medical professional self regulation, by means of codified professional self discipline, was actually conceived in Britain, by Dr Thomas Percival, but born in America. The American Medical Ethics Revolution, through the medium of a tetrad of editors and a stellar collection of luminaries, displays the pedigree of codified American medical ethical thought back to its earliest progenitor: the primordial 1847 American Medical Association (AMA) code of ethics. The people are duly handled academicians, and the volume is comprised of 20 chapters and several appendices, showing the ethos of superb scholarship, illumining the path to moral rectitude, and barriers along the way, for academicians.

The lengthy time continuum of the volume encompasses forward-looking comments on future challenges to medical ethics, involving, for example, molecular medicine. Given the uncertain role of ethics in the unfolding genetics revolution, it cannot be gainsaid that it is timely and potentially salutary, to ponder, in an informed intellectual sense, whether codified ethics can favourably guide the future of biomedicine.

The recondite nature of this volume is well tailored to suit the curiosity of academically inclined readers interested in medical ethics in America. Its abstruseness, however, is ill tailored to fit the lay reader; and may even fall outside the ken of comfort of some clinicians. In this respect, the volume is ineffectual as an introduction to medical ethics, and genetic enhancement. He thinks the dissonance, albeit of continued vitality, the dissonance that we have no morally unproblematic, germ-line gene therapy and germ-line enhancement is morally unacceptable. Knopffler does not explain why, exactly, this follows. At one point he seems to suggest that the fact that we have no reason to read is, let us suppose, a socially constructed disability. Suppose we could make everyone read using moderate resources, and that a society in which disability was not a disadvantage would be in many respects much worse than ours. Why should we prefer, morally speaking, the latter option? The more general point is that it is unclear why, from the point of view of justice, a society in which people do not have disabilities would be preferable to a society in which each of us is well off to the same extent but there is less human heterogeneity.

In his contribution, Nikolaus Knopffler embrace the Kantian idea of human dignity, and treats it as the fundamental principle of bioethics. Roughly, in his view this idea implies that, whereas somatic gene therapy is morally unproblematic, germ-line gene therapy and germ-line enhancement are morally unacceptable. Knopffler does not explain why, exactly, this follows. At one point he seems to suggest that the fact that we have no common grounds for determining whether enhancements are desirable implies that enhancement violates the Kantian principle, but such irresolvable disagreements simply seem beside the point.

In an interesting article, Christian Muntehe convincingly argues that there is no morally relevant difference between genetic interventions involving the treatment of a particular individual and genetic interventions involving the exchange of disease between one person for another. Examples of the latter sort of intervention include the preselection of embryos based on preimplantation genetic diagnosis.

Creating Accepting Communities

S Dunn. MIND [National Association for Mental Health], 1999, £9.99 (£1 p+p), pp 181. ISBN 1874690871

The government's social exclusion unit (SEU) was established to help individuals, groups, and regions overcome deprivation and discrimination resulting from a combination of problems, including unemployment, poor
quality housing, low income, lack of educational training opportunities, bad health, and family breakdown. Such difficulties are commonly experienced by people with mental health problems who also have to cope in a society which alienates and rejects them, barring them from every aspect of community life. Remarkably, even the SEU’s remit excludes consideration of the obstacles to social inclusion faced by those with a psychiatric diagnosis.

Creating Accepting Communities is the final report of an inquiry commissioned by MIND, which looked at the nature and extent of social exclusion experienced by people who use mental health services in Britain. The inquiry panel received written and oral evidence from a wide range of individuals and organisations, including mental health practitioners, high street retailers, groups working within the voluntary sector, and, importantly, service users.

The book is clearly written and the material well organised into four main chapters, each of which contains a useful summary of the key issues raised. Quotations from witnesses are used extensively throughout the narrative, giving real meaning to the findings, and to participants a sense of “ownership” in the report.

The first chapter summarises evidence presented to the inquiry on how a psychiatric diagnosis can exclude people from a range of socially significant areas such as employment, education and training, aspects of daily life (that is, access to goods and services, social networks, etc) and empowerment within mental health services. The panel found widespread evidence of social exclusion and dismissed claims that this was simply the result of poverty. Instead, they argue that while policy initiatives should focus on addressing material circumstances of service users, they should also work towards creating greater social cohesion or social inclusion.

A range of ethical aspects associated with social inclusion is briefly but coherently discussed in chapter 2. In particular, inquiry evidence is used to evaluate the relationship between individuals and their wider community, and to address the following questions: how do societies judge the value of a person’s life? How does society differentiate individual “badness” from “mental illness”? How should risk be defined? What is meant by the participation and empowerment of service users? Essentially, the findings support the basic need to recognise the absolute value of individuals and to acknowledge that any ethical approach to social inclusion needs to balance this against existing social forces: differences can only be resolved through the participation of everyone involved.

Chapter 3 discusses a range of initiatives that have been set up to promote social inclusion in various areas of work, education, the arts and the media, daily living, and the mental health services. The panel highlighted three areas where more work should be done to improve social inclusion: the development of the arts initiatives based on inter-agency cooperation, legal and policy-based reforms at national level and the promotion of more intensive public education programmes on national level and the promotion of more cooperation, legal and policy-based reforms at national level and the promotion of more local initiatives based on inter-agency cooperation.

In chapter 4 they examine the basis for public involvement in priority setting. Given that many think that public involvement in the setting of priorities is a good thing they ask the pertinent question, whether such involvement would result in the optimum set of priorities and consider whether it may risk a “dictatorship of the uninformed” (page 34). Other key difficulties addressed are the problems of finding a group that can be considered representative.

In chapter four they survey the traditional approaches to priority setting. This includes a detailed section on QALYs and the standard objections to them. This chapter contains an interesting section on how the rule of rescue can conflict with the maximisation of health care gain that is associated with QALYs (pages 44–45). They cite the Jaymee Bowen case as an example of the depth of feeling that can be evoked when the rule of rescue conflicts with the maximisation of health care benefit.

Their sixth chapter considers in some depth empirical methods that can be used to elicit the values of the public about priority setting. They present a broad range of possible methods in a way that makes them useful, not only for ascertaining views about prioritisation but also for gaining information about other empirical questions within medical ethics.

Creating Accepting Communities is undoubtedly of paramount concern in developing countries. It is inevitable that some issues are dealt with in a fairly summary fashion, but when they do this the authors make reference to the wider literature.

All those interested in prioritisation and the NHS ought to read this book. It’s likely to be of special interest to those making prioritisation decisions at all levels.

A Colombo

Priority Setting and the Public


As its title suggests this book’s main area of inquiry is the rationale for, and methodology of, public involvement in priority setting. Mullen and Spurgeon set out to evaluate a number of assumptions and hard issues in priority setting. In doing so they have produced a volume that is both a useful introduction to this area and a worthy piece of research on an important theme.

They begin by contextualising the debate about priority setting within the recent history of health system reform in the UK and other nations. This move enables them to give an analysis of considerable scope. They are not just interested in rationing and public involvement but also in questions about the level to which the UK National Health Service (NHS) ought to be publicly funded. Given the frequently stated assumption that rationing is inevitable it is very refreshing to read a book that grapples with the difficult, more primary question of whether rationing itself is in fact necessary.

They note that reform processes and initiatives in the health system have served to focus attention on the need for priority setting but that there is a need to evaluate carefully the basis of this need. The present level of funding that the NHS receives is a matter of choice and not simply a result of day-to-day necessity, as is frequently implied. They suggest that we should think carefully about the inevitability of rationing and our inability to pay and instead work out how to provide treatments that are of proven benefit.

In chapter three they examine the basis for public involvement in priority setting. Given that many think that public involvement in the setting of priorities is a good thing they ask the pertinent question, whether such involvement and provides an informative overview of current policy and practice initiatives. Unfortunately, because the book’s remit is so wide, its depth of analysis is compromised, leaving unchallenged some very difficult ethical barri- ers to social inclusion.

For example, little is currently known about the nature of the connections between “them and us” and the consequences of these interactions for the promotion of a society based on “inclusive diversity,” particularly in the face of: 1) growing public demands for more zero tolerance initiatives; 2) the threat of new legislation designed to exclude those with a personality disorder, those who fail to comply with medication while living in the community and those who are disruptive in schools; 3) media campaigns provoking street demonstrations against groups the media feels society should no longer tolerate, and 4) employment practices which measure individual value in terms of productivity to the point whereby even mental health services lack confidence in service users’ abilities.

Ultimately, the problem of analytical depth is a methodological one that requires the development and implementation of research initiatives at both the micro and macro levels of social inquiry. Moreover, these observations should not detract from what is an excellent report and an important reference point for anyone interested in the social inclusion of people who experience mental ill health.

J McMillon

Catholic Ethicists on HIV/AIDS Prevention


This impressive and informative book deserves a wider readership than it is likely to get. Unfortunately there are still too many people who consider they have no need to read anything about the virus as it will, to their way of thinking, never touch them. In addition there will be those who think that a volume by Catholic ethicists will be too narrow in outlook to be worthwhile. Both sets of people are mistaken. However, there is no cure nor is there likely to be and sooner or later it will affect, let alone infect, millions across the world. On the second count readers will be surprised and energised by the clear and honest debate concerning the teachings of the Catholic Church.

The first and longest section is made up of a series of case studies ranging from needle exchange in Puerto Rico, to confronting social stigma in Uganda, and matters relating to confidentiality in Australia. The second consists of seven chapters covering fundamental moral issues for HIV prevention; the chapter on selective HIV prevention is poorly written. Kevin Kelly (Liverpool, UK) provides the conclusion. Readers would do well to get hold of New Directions in Sexual Ethics, (Geoffrey Chapman, 1998) in which he highlights what is undoubtedly of paramount concern in developing countries namely poverty, the subjugation of women and a related lack of respect for them.

The most obvious moral issues are those surrounding the use of condoms but they are not the only ones. What if an infected person refuses to tell his or her partner of their status? Is any duty incumbent on the doctor treating the
the positive person to inform the partner? Where does confidentiality begin and end? One of the saddest cases, and not as rare as it may seem, is of a married couple in Italy, both infected, who want to have a child. Will the child also be seropositive? Will one or both parents live long enough to see the child? Who else should know of the situation?

The Catholic Church has always had high ideals even if many of its adherents, including some of its leaders of power and authority, have not lived up to them. Those ideals cover not just areas of chastity and fidelity but also those of charity and truth where each one of us has to strive constantly to live up to a more rigorous version of all the Ten Commandments. The Church has particularly strong teaching on fidelity in marriage and against premarital and extramarital sex. It is important to recognise the connection between this strong teaching and the basic values of family life and the worth of the individual, on the one hand and, on the other, the abuses that arise from pressures on innocent girls and women, particularly in some cultures. A universal approval of condom use would be its greatest ill. With greater ills and diseases comes the question: how can we work towards the time when married couples have sufficient education and knowledge to work out for themselves the right use of conscience with regard to their sexual relations? Even if we are not necessarily saying there are other options when a solution is far from obvious: we have to remind ourselves frequently that we are fallible human beings with free will. This book gives a strong impetus towards enabling the leaders to consider and ponder at some considerable depth, a variety of dilemmas and questions.

In so many countries, including our own, a conspiracy of silence, of denial, has grown up in response to AIDS. It is only when HIV is looked at objectively and dispassionately, regardless of the moral stigma that so often haunts those affected by the virus, that the real work of prevention will occur. Educational work is vital. Only when we understand what the virus is, how it is passed on, what it does to individuals and to families—not least those of us who love. This book should be widely read and discussed in schools and colleges, in religious communities, in those areas of society that can most influence the development of young people. HIV/AIDS is a reality that will affect everyone. How we deal with it is a measure of our humanity and vision of the future.
syndrome children, Rapo highlights the disjunction between technological advance in genetics and biotechnology and the human response of families who care for such children. A further chapter deals with "bio-mental" or "bio-social" conditions, notably MCS (multiple chemical sensitivity) and finds that in the light of conflicting interests and under-funded research any explanation of these sociomedical disorders is likely to be tentative and locally determined. The last two essays deal with organ transplantation and unpack the problem of the dichotomy of the "gift of life" that organ donation from brain dead persons presents, versus any sentiment concerned with keeping dying patients intact—a dilemma that is much felt even within the medical profession. Approaches differ between the US and Japan. The ethical dilemma is compatible but at present there are various solutions. Ethics are generally more implicit than overt but it is agreed that they are diffusely socially determined. The final essay, which considers the ethics involved in transplant procuring whether by giving selling or cadaver donation, finds that regulations aimed at safeguarding certain rights may themselves infringe customary perceptions of what is moral. Some of the problems would benefit from an anthropological analysis that takes account of the specificity of small local communities.

There are no final answers in this book, but the at times diverse essays bring together highly topical discussions about the rights and wrongs of a world that is just opening up.

C R Barber

Animals in Research: For and Against


The use of animals for the purpose of scientific research is an emotive subject. The moral arguments often exhibit polarised positions: the scientific demand for absolute freedom of research, and the abolitionist demand for a total ban on all animal experiments. At one extreme are those who argue that research on animals is essential for the conquest of many unsolved medical problems, and on the other extreme it is argued that the cost in terms of animal suffering is too high and that if experiments were prohibited medical researchers would find some other means of ensuring scientific progress. The rhetoric employed is also suggestive of a polarisation of moral perspectives, and that regulations aimed at safeguarding certain rights may themselves infringe customary perceptions of what is moral. Some of the problems would benefit from an anthropological analysis that takes account of the specificity of small local communities.

There are no final answers in this book, but the at times diverse essays bring together highly topical discussions about the rights and wrongs of a world that is just opening up.

C R Barber

The Foundations of Christian Bioethics


In this book, H Tristram Engelhardt Jr outlines his interpretation of Christian bioethics. His branch of Christianity, termed "traditional Christianity", is described as "the Christianity of the first millennium". Authority is derived from the church fathers and the church fathers are continuous with the church community, in accordance with "the Spirit" (this is contrasted with Western Christianity's use of scriptures and philosophical theology).

In the first half of the book (chapters 1–4) Engelhardt describes the contemporary moral condition, charactrised by moral diversity and fragmentedness. He begins with the emotive effect of pluralism on moral values and the lack of mechanisms to distinguish between opposing value systems. He terms the present state of affairs as "liberal cosmopolitanism" and argues that these "values" are not separated by "the principle of permission"—that is, moral authority legitimised by the autonomous choices of those who collaborate; it is procured by those otherwise disparate parties can agree. Replacement and reduction seek to minimise the number of animals used in research and refinement is bound up with the minimisation of pain, distress and suffering upon animals. This discussion is the most significant part of the book, as it indicates the possibility of dialogue and consensus among medical scientists, animal welfare campaigners, government bodies, teachers, and regulatory agencies. Grayson recognises that medical scientists are ethical and shows how the research community have demonstrated that scientists are taking legitimate concerns about animal welfare seriously. She refers to the British Association for the Advancement of Science which maintains that continued research involving animals is essential for the conquest of many unsolved medical problems, but recognises that those involved must respect animal life, using animals only when essential, and should adopt alternative methods when available. Grayson also refers to a survey of British doctors in 1993, which indicated 94% agreement that animal research was important to medical advance, while 92% favoured more investment in the development of non-animal alternatives (page 36).

The first two chapters look to the future. Grayson argues that the debate on animal research is likely to intensify, with concern over transgenic animals and the use of animals as organ transplant sources. For those who are interested in the ongoing debate over animal research the final chapter provides comprehensive details of relevant organisations and web sites.

This is an excellent introduction to the animal experiment debate. Each chapter is carefully balanced and is free from the emotive rhetoric which so often clouds the arguments. Moreover, there are summaries, lists of publications, and charts about interest groups which are relevant to each standpoint covered in the book. Animals in Research is an essential source for teachers and researchers in the veterinary sciences, and it will be of considerable value to the ethicist who is concerned with the broader moral issues related to medical research and human wellbeing.

D Lamb
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Kierkegaard, as well as an introduction to the ethics of Orthodox Christianity. On balance, however, this book will perhaps seem somewhat irrelevant to contemporary bioethicists, although it may prove of more interest to theologians, especially those of the more conservative persuasion, such as the emerging school of radical orthodoxy. Ultimately, the difficulty with Engelhardt’s position is communication. His rejection of “liberal cosmopolitanism” leads to an unwillingness to compromise, which makes it difficult for those from the “liberal cosmopolitan” world-view to hear his points; this is somewhat problematic given that his intended audience is the academic community.

H Widdows

**NOTICE**

A Cross-cultural Dialogue on Ethical Challenges in Healthcare

An international conference on health care ethics, A Cross-cultural Dialogue on Ethical Challenges in Healthcare, is to be held in Abu Dhabi, the capital of the United Arab Emirates, from 10–13 March 2002. It is being organised by the UAE Ministry of Health. Co-sponsors of the conference include the World Health Organization (WHO), the Islamic Organization for Medical Sciences (IOMS), the International Association of Bioethics (IAB), the Emirates Medical Association (EMA), and the Gulf Center for Excellence in Ethics (GCEE).

As the first such conference in the Arab and Muslim world, it aims to bring together scholars and experts from around the world to address a wide range of ethical and social considerations in the planning and delivery of health care.

The objectives of the conference are to: promote a cross-cultural dialogue towards agreement on universal standards of health care ethics; highlight the Islamic world’s contribution to this process; enhance awareness and knowledge of contemporary ethical issues in health care, and to build national and regional capacity to address complex bioethics issues against the backdrop of rapid advancements in the health sciences.

The conference will examine a broad range of contemporary health care ethics topics including: current controversies in research involving human subjects in developing countries; ethical decisions and considerations in clinical practice; social issues in genomics; strategies for allocating scarce resources; access issues in health systems, and building a bioethics capacity and infrastructure in the UAE, Gulf region, and Arab world.

For copies of the conference programme and registration forms please contact: Dr Basil A Badir, Conference Coordinator, Ministry of Health, PO Box 26094, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Telephone: +971(2) 6330186 and +971(50) 6325110; fax: +971(2) 6321878 and +971(2) 6349223; email: moh_basilb@hotmail.com and ethics_conf@moh.gov.ae Website: http://www.uae.gov.ae/moh/start.htm

**CORRECTION**

In the December 2001 issue of the journal the Book reviews section was incorrectly headed Letters. We wish to apologise to readers for any inconvenience this error caused.