was wonderful, dear. How was it for you?"
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Health Care for an Aging Population
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Allocation of health care resources
and access to them is a widely debated
issue throughout the world. This book
is a collection of essays by multiple
authors in response to Daniel
Callahan’s book Setting Limits: Medical
Goals in an Aging Society.

Callahan proposed withholding life-
saving treatment from the very elderly
as a form of rationing. The discussion
relates to the American health care
system although the broader issues
are applicable elsewhere, with future
resources being more limited and with
ever-expanding numbers of elderly
patients requiring treatment.

There is consensus amongst the
authors that the US health care
system needs reform, with universal
right of access for all to basic health
care but that non-basic care is not a
universal right. The specific health
needs of the elderly must be met
ahead of high-technology acute care,
with special reference to long-term
and home care with palliation and
relief of suffering. The positive image
of aging needs to be promoted, stress-
ing the large contributions that elderly
people have to make to society, in the
face of the current climate of inter-
generational conflict that is so
pervasive.

Rationing of health care will
become imperative as there is increasing
need, but in an era of cost
containment resources are finite and therefore
will be limited. The methods
by which rationing can be applied and
savings achieved are addressed in this
book, with a variety of proposals.

Rationing can be resource-based,
applied by government, legislators or
administrators, or it can be patient-
centred, performed at the site of
delivery by physicians. Callahan’s
proposals are discussed in detail in
chapter 6 where the scarcity of
resources is stressed and the impor-
tance of allocating such resources
effectively and with maximal medical
benefit is seen as paramount.

Some authors think age-based
rationing is ethically immoral, taking
care away from those most deserving
and most in need. Callahan and others
have agreed that it is a form of
discrimination against the elderly, but
contend that the alternatives may be
even worse, limiting health care
younger individuals who have not yet
achieved their full potential in life. He
feels that the elderly themselves would
see the sense of his argument if the
issues were properly addressed.

Stymsma thinks that Callahan has used
age wrongly, when quality-of-life con-
siderations actually underlie his
argument. If a natural lifespan is
adopted for rationing, then it ignores
the significant quality of life possible
for the healthy elderly person with an
eminently treatable infection.

Perhaps the most important issue
to be discussed in this book is the nature
of rationing. In the present climate,
rationing does occur in an implicit
manner which is not perceived as
iniquitous, such as lack of provision
of nursing-home beds or lack of avail-
ability of dialysis facilities. Callahan
has merely brought rationing to the
attention of a wider audience and has
provoked much discussion as to how
it should be applied. There is little
doubt that in future rationing will
have to be explicit, with widespread
discussion and debate in a democratic
fashion. The community to which it
will be applied will have to be prime
movers so that the self-imposition of
such rationing is acceptable.

Alternative proposals should not be
discounted out of hand since much
current policy has not been subjected
to the same scrutiny. Flexible categor-
ical rationing which has been the sub-
ject of public debate may be a good
compromise, setting priorities clearly
but allowing for discretion by the
physician in individual cases. How-
ever, more fixed targets may be
required if budgetary constraints are
to be met reliably.

Dr Hackler has edited a fascinating
collection of opinions from leading
ethicists, philosophers and physicians.
Their concerns for the future of the
American health care system can be
extrapolated to all societies, since the
aging population and the provision of
health care to increasing numbers of
elderly patients is a worry for all
concerned. This book is thought-
provoking and whilst not reaching a
consensus opinion, aims to provide
several possible alternative strategies
to deal with this daunting problem for
all providers of health care.

JO PORTER
Senior Registrar,
Department of Clinical Geriatrics,
Radcliffe Infirmary,
Oxford.

The Ethics of Human Gene
Therapy

Le Roy Walters and Julie Gage Palmer,
Oxford, Oxford University Press,

Such is the pace of development in
molecular biology and genetic research that books on the
subject become outdated almost
before they are timely. It is for this
reason that Walters and Palmer’s
book has been ten years in the writing.

The authors have endeavoured to
strike a balance between giving readers
details of what is currently (or
imminently) available, and raising
some of the ethical challenges it
poses. It is a short book on a vast topic
and is obviously written with a view to
attracting a wide readership. It is
unlikely to be of interest to specialists
either in the field of human genetics or
in medical ethics. Where it may be of
benefit is as a primer, either at under-
graduate level, or for use with
trainee health care professionals
within the context of a broader intro-
duction to medical ethics. The
authors clearly have one eye on the
popular science market but as their
book is presently only available
in hardback, and given its brevity in rela-
tion to its price, it would require sig-
nificant revision to achieve mass
appeal.

They begin with the true story of
the life and death of David, “the boy
in the bubble”, afflicted with severe
combined immune deficiency
(SCID). Although this represents a
laudable attempt to personalise the
debate often dominated by technicali-
ties, the account teeters dangerously
close to Dickensian sentimentality.

This is compounded by the fact that
there is little done to relate this section
to the later chapters. The authors
stated intention here is to show “that
the field of human gene therapy is important” (page xvi).
However, it is unclear that anyone disputes this. Certainly nobody who chooses to
read this book would. Moreover, the
existence of disease is an argument only against those who would question the benefit of medical research per se. The ethical issues raised by human gene therapy, insofar as they are distinguishable from the broader discussion of medical ethics, surely cannot be addressed by an appeal to extant human suffering.

This is followed by a clear and concise introduction to the science of genetics and the therapeutic implications of current research. These sections could be read profitably by anyone not familiar with contemporary developments and the scientific background to them. They are well written, accompanied by clear illustrations and the technical vocabulary is kept to a minimum. The first chapter deals with background Mendelian and post-Mendelian theory. Subsequent chapters are structured on the basis of what the authors refer to as the “conceptual distinctions” (page xvii) between somatic and germ line gene therapy and “between the prevention, treatment, cure of a disease, on the one hand, and enhancement of human characteristics or capabilities, on the other (page xvii). The fact that the authors acknowledge this latter set of distinctions as problematic, yet at no point make any sustained effort to expand upon this, prevents the work from moving beyond the level of a “whistle stop tour” of the issue. The authors argue that there is little substantively new raised by somatic therapy and even germ line techniques, and thus any difficulties can be effectively dealt with on the basis of control by public and expert opinion and codes governing access of patients, such as the US National Institute of Health (NIH), Recombinant DNA Advisory Committee’s Points to Consider (appendix D: 171–85).

In chapter four, we enter the area of enhancement therapy. This is where the most significant ethical issues arise and it is here that the strengths and weaknesses of the authors’ treatment become most apparent. What we are offered is a wide-angled view both of the practical possibilities and the concomitant problems. It is the avoidance of abstract speculation in favour of laying out the facts that characterises the book. Anyone reading it for an in-depth discussion of either technological or ethical issues is likely to be disappointed.

Were the book to be used for teaching purposes it would need careful handling as there are points at which the authors’ eagerness to address as much as possible leads to what can only be viewed as flaws in the argument. For instance, very little attention is given to what must be a central (if not the central) issue: the control and allocation of resources. While this is clearly not something unique to genetically based therapies, if we accept, with the authors, that this is a vitally important area of medicine, then some reassurances need to be given that any benefits will be divided in the most equitable manner. What attention they do pay to the topic is limited to the idea that it ought to be something decided by appropriate legislation and quasi-algorithmic codes of practice within a laissez-faire framework, perhaps modified by social and political mores. Conversely, the authors do little to assuage genuine public concerns regarding potential misuses. The spectrum of eugenics hangs heavy over the whole field and while we may concur with the writers’ assertions that the immorality of previous programmes lay in the immorality of their perpetrators, it is surely little comfort to be told that the impatience of tyrants, combined with the strength of democratic institutions will protect us (page 86). Given the obvious attraction of genetic therapy, absolute control over its allocation would be a welcome addition to any despot’s arsenal. Neither would it necessitate the overthrow of parliamen
dary democracy to foresee a situation in which unscrupulous employers pressurised their workers into undergoing genetic therapy to reduce their desire for sleep, something the authors tell us is well within the realms of possibility (pages 114–5).

Bearing all this in mind the book could, with appropriate supplementation, become a valuable addition to a teaching programme. It would require a substantially longer and more detailed work to begin addressing some of the more profound problems that recombinant DNA therapy raises. It is to be hoped that we do not have to wait a further ten years for its appearance.

RICHARD PAUL HAMILTON
Department of Philosophy,
The University of Manchester

Complementary Medicine and the Law

Julie Stone and Joan Mathews,
Oxford, Oxford University Press,
1996, 306 pages, £30.00 hc,
£12.99 sc.

The rise of complementary medicine in the United Kingdom poses a range of ethical issues for legislators and for the existing bodies regulating medical practice and professions associated with medicine. Some of these issues are particularly sensitive, as in the case with “ethnic medicine”, where cultural sensitivities are involved. Most of us would accept that the government has a right (indeed, a duty) to regulate the availability of substances sold as drugs, but does this right extend to the exercise of control over what may be used by the practitioners of Chinese medicine who use substances which fall outside the range of conventional medicines? Some of these imported substances are adulterated with dangerous additions and are capable of harming the patients. Yet to regulate their use may be seen as insensitive to a claimed right of minority communities to pursue their own therapies in their own manner.

The authors of this exceptionally useful survey of the legal position of complementary medicine tackle this and related issues with tact. They are sensitive to the fundamental dilemma facing those who would subject complementary medicine to more rigorous control: such control, even if necessary to avoid the causing of harm by untrained and possibly unsupervisory practitioners, risks placing the complementary therapies in a straitjacket. The whole point of complementary medicine is that it pursues its goals in a way which differs from conventional medicine. Its resources, too, may be idiosyncratic; it may be difficult to prove the efficacy of a herbal remedy in the same way in which one may prove the efficacy of a Western drug. Clinical trials may not make sense in a system in which the practitioner is using a substance as part of the holistic treating of a patient. And then, of course, some remedies may defy the mechanistic notions of contemporary science. Can homoeopathic remedies possibly work in their extraordinary dilutions? Conventional science would answer that this is impossible, and yet homoeopathic practitioners point to the results they achieve as an indication that something is happening which conventional science may not be able to explain. For many believers in complementary therapies, the arguments used against them make sense only within a system of scientific explanation which they question. They resent...