

2-1-1976

[Book Review of] *Experiments and Research with Humans: Values in Conflict*, a record of the Academy Forum convened on February 18 and 19, 1975

Albert Moraczewski

Follow this and additional works at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq>



Part of the [Ethics and Political Philosophy Commons](#), and the [Medicine and Health Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Moraczewski, Albert (1976) "[Book Review of] *Experiments and Research with Humans: Values in Conflict*, a record of the Academy Forum convened on February 18 and 19, 1975," *The Linacre Quarterly*: Vol. 43: No. 1, Article 11.
Available at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq/vol43/iss1/11>

to tell us when they are no longer needed is a dichotomy of far-reaching consequence. We must never use our technology to bring death to someone, but we must never use it to keep alive a body from whom a soul has departed.

I have yet to find a book that presents a totally objective view of euthanasia. Perhaps that would be impossible. But Wilson's work

has been cautious, complete, accurate, and very minimally emotional. I recommend it as a valuable resource from which to begin an analysis of the issues presented in this review.

Reviewed by:

Paul R. Gastonguay
Associate Professor of Biology
Stonehill College
North Easton, Mass.

Experiments and Research with Humans: Values in Conflict

National Academy of Sciences. 1975, 234 p., \$5.00 (paper).

This volume is a record of the Academy Forum convened on February 18 and 19, 1975, to consider some of the conflicting values surrounding research involving human subjects. This reviewer is in the interesting position of having attended the Forum.

It is stated in the foreword: "The Academy Forum projects the proposition that effectively designed policy and its implementation must recognize the interests and needs of all relevant constituencies . . . private citizens, government, industry, public interest groups, the scientific community . . ." In light of this commendable policy statement, it is the opinion of the reviewer that this particular Academy Forum fell short of meeting its own standards. As one physician in the audience stated: "So far we have had a parade of speakers, the overwhelming majority of

whom have been fairly highly placed in the biomedical establishment, if you will . . . it disturbs me somewhat that the challengers have come from the floor. This meeting was advertised as a Forum, and not as a defense of biomedical research as it is presently conducted . . ." (p. 85).

Having been in attendance, I can speak to the fact that an honest effort appears to have been made to include all the remarks from the floor and to report them accurately. A few days after the meeting, for example, I received a call from a staff member of the Academy who was making sure that my remarks (pp. 50 and 84) were being correctly quoted.

This report, then, seems to be a faithful representation of what actually transpired at the Forum. The main areas covered were: (1) a cultural and historical view of biomedical research, (2) the bene-

fits of research, (3) the risks of research, (4) what consent is needed, (5) fetal research, (6) how risks are distributed with reference to the military and to the prisoner and to the poor, (7) National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, and (8) future policy options.

The speakers and discussants were, for the most part, academic people of outstanding reputation in various biomedical and philosophical disciplines. It is my impression, however, that the discussion of fetal research was one-sided; none of the speakers or discussants spoke out decisively in defense of the fetus. This is in distinction to discussion involving prisoners or the poor, for whom there were articulate advocates. One had the impression that, as always, the fetus seems to get the least adequate representation in the public forum.

There were some moments of genuine conflict when, for example, the president of a pharmaceutical firm said that his company had been involved in prison research for 15 years and mentioned a particular prison. He pointed out that there were programs of rehabilitation and that as much freedom was given to the prisoners as was consistent with their situation. He felt that as a result of participation in medical experimentation the self-esteem of the prison was increased. On the other hand, an attorney rep-

resenting prisoners said that this particular prison "is one of the most gross monstrosities in this country" (p. 140), and that there were no such rehabilitative programs. The pharmaceutical representative responded by saying that this was incorrect, and that he personally has visited the prison and can testify by virtue of personal experience to the reality of what he said. This confrontation remained unresolved. It was representative of the constant difficulty of ascertaining the facts in issues heavily laden with emotion.

The National Academy of Sciences is to be complimented on its efforts to promote a public discussion of these issues and to make these discussions available as rapidly as possible to the reading public. The original papers and the discussants' reactions represent a high-level discussion of a number of difficult and complex topics. It is apparent, however, that there is need for much clarification of issues, and that further interdisciplinary dialogue is required. Nonetheless, this volume does represent a step forward in making the public aware of these issues and in conveying the pluralistic values that appear operative in the discussions of such problems.

Reviewed by:
Albert Moraczewski,
O.P., Ph.D.
President, Pope John XXIII
Medical-Moral Research
and Education Center
St. Louis, Missouri