the need for transplantable organs. Some estimates cited in this collection of essays suggest that the use of brain-injured, but not brain dead, patients would increase the US donor pool by 20 per cent to 25 per cent, whilst in the Netherlands it is said that NHBCDs have raised the procurement of kidneys from 32 to 41 kidneys per million of the population each year. There are eleven active NHBCD programmes in Europe. In the UK NHBCDs are known as ‘asystolic donors’. According to two American contributors an NHBCD programme operates in Leicester, England, with the approval of ‘the local District Attorney’!

The book is evenly divided between supporters and critics of NHBCD protocols and the latter focus on the ‘dead donor rule’ or separation principle of transplant ethics, according to which vital organs must only be taken from dead patients; patients must not be killed by the removal of vital organs, and care for living patients should not be compromised by the needs of organ recipients. According to the Pittsburgh Protocol, criteria for death are met by evidence of absence of pulse pressure and two minutes of ventricular fibrillation, asystole, or electromagnetic disassociation. Critics insist that two minutes of pulselessness is an inadequate guarantee that auto-resuscitation will not occur and express reservations concerning the initiation of procedures to excise organs from patients with continuing brain function.

Opponents of brain death have asked whether the donors are really dead when evidence of irreversible loss of brain function has been demonstrated despite residual heart function. Now opponents of cardio-centric definitions of death may ask similar questions concerning donors with warm bodies and possibly healthy brains. One thing is certain: two minutes of pulseless apnoea in the operating theatre would not fulfil criteria for brainstem death. The Pittsburgh Protocol thus initiates a radical choice between two very distinct concepts of death.

As yet there has been little or no public discussion of NHBCDs and no media events comparable to the notorious BBC Panorama programme on brain death in 1983. But there is an urgent need for a full debate about organ removal after elective withdrawal of therapy and a firm commitment that guidelines which protect the dying are not discarded in favour of policies to increase the donor pool. This volume makes an excellent contribution to that debate.

DAVID LAMB
Reader in Philosophy,
Department of Biomedical Science and Biomedical Ethics,
University of Birmingham

Bioethics for the people by the people

Darryl R J Macer, Christchurch, New Zealand and Tsukuba, Japan, Eubios Ethics Institute, Japan, 1994, 452 pages, £15.00 sc.

This book consists in part of a survey of attitudes amongst a wider public than health care professionals and specialist bioethicists. It was conducted to discover what ‘ordinary’ people think bioethics is about, and what they regard the central issues as being. More than 6,000 questionnaires were returned from ten countries in 1993, and the book, to some extent, summarises the findings. It stems from a firm belief held by Darryl Macer that bioethics should not be the treasured possession of the professionals, nor of the Western world. Hence he adds to his own name on the cover, and through the book: ‘with contributions from some friends, and from the people’.

It makes fascinating reading insofar as the material makes sense, but some of the time one suspects that the meaning of words is taken so differently between certain different cultures that some of the answers may not be comparable. That aside, this is an important attempt to give a picture of different attitudes. But an attempt is all it is. What one misses is true analysis. We get some moderately undigested data, and lots of diagrams to show variation. We also get a series of drawings produced by different country groups, and a series of answers to the questions simply reproduced. Though I am sure it is interesting to see how Macer and his colleagues conducted their survey, in fact it would be more useful to have less raw data, and more real analysis.

But that analysis is very difficult to do. Nevertheless, Macer demonstrates a general reluctance in all societies surveyed to allow the patenting of life, particularly of human genes, as well as high approval for gene therapy. There was also a split – usually within country groups – on eugenics, and a demonstrable general attitude of more shame and blame for the birth of a handicapped child in Asia than in Western societies.

Most of this is not news. Though it is important to understand what the main issues are which make people concerned in the bioethical field, one can often acquire that knowledge, at least in general, from reading the press of the country concerned. In Britain, for instance, there is concern about some of the more unusual aspects of IVF, but general admiration for the fact that we license and control centres performing such techniques. In fact, we know that from the media and from Parliament, though neither may be wholly representative of the people.

That element of consideration of the issues, by viewing the press and the political process, is sadly missing from Macer’s book, as are other aspects of analysis, and true comparison between cultures. So, although this is a brave attempt, the work itself is not constructed to be readable, approachable, or even very useful in more than general terms for finding out what views, and deeply held cultural attitudes, exist in countries other than one’s own. We need another volume, of analysis and comment, before we get a true picture.

JULIA NEUBERGER
Chair, Camden and Islington Community Health Services NHS Trust

Moral matters: ethical issues in medicine and the life sciences


The ninety-four essays included in this volume began their lives as newspaper articles. Nearly all of them first appeared, in the past few years, in the St Paul Pioneer Press, a newspaper based in St Paul, Minnesota. They were written by Arthur Caplan, Director of the Center for Bioethics, and Trustee Professor of Bioethics at the University of Pennsylvania. In his foreword, George D Lundberg, editor of The Journal of the American Medical Association rates Caplan ‘in everyone’s top five list of gurus in the American ethics mafia’. In Lundberg’s estimation, ‘Art Caplan is the ideal person to