

2-1-1978

[Book Review of] *Bioethics* edited by Thomas A. Shannon

Priscilla Snell

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

Snell, Priscilla (1978) "[Book Review of] *Bioethics* edited by Thomas A. Shannon," *The Linacre Quarterly*: Vol. 45: No. 1, Article 21. Available at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq/vol45/iss1/21>

about lesbianism" (p. 63). But then Drakeford is a psychologist, not an exegete. Unfortunately, in the chapter on the bible and homosexuality all exegetical reasoning is his own. The reasoning is no doubt shared by others but no biblical scholar is cited in support of any statement made.

As a religiously oriented psychologist, Drakeford is convinced that many homosexuals can be helped with professional assistance and, of course, the grace of God. Presupposed is strong motivation on the part of a homosexual to want to be helped. And Drakeford details a therapeutic approach, "Integrity Therapy," which is "no cure in the sense that one will be immediately and forever delivered from his homosexuality" but one that will provide "some techniques of handling his wayward sexual impulse and getting it under control" (p. 117). This should be most encouraging to anyone who, like Jeff J., could never afford the time or expense involved in psychoanalytic treatment (\$100,000, two to five sessions a week for two to five years) which in the end might be totally ineffective. (Even if this treatment were effective, and cost only half as much, ethically speaking it would amount to extraordinary means which no one is obligated to use!) Essentially, the therapy described is much the same as that involved in Alcoholics Anonymous.

A Christian View of Homosexuality is a moving account describing one man's attempt to resurrect himself, an account that is free of jargon and full of hope. Drakeford himself is passionate regarding the civil rights of homosexuals and in this he parts company with Anita Bryant whose own "Christian" view is questionable. The book's title, however, is misleading. On the one hand it purports to be *the* Christian view, while on the other hand, there is nothing that proves the approach to be specifically Christian; a devout non-Christian or a person of no religious persuasion could argue the same way, biblical passages notwithstanding.

— Dennis J. Doherty, Dr. theol.
Marquette University

Bioethics

Thomas A. Shannon, Editor

Paulist Press, 1865 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 10023, 1976. 513 pp., \$9.95 (paper).

This collection of essays is subtitled, "Basic Writings on the key ethical questions that surround the major biological possibilities and problems." The problems are those posed by recent advances in medical scientific technology. Certain basic issues which have surfaced include the constitutive elements of personhood, the right of a person vs. the rights of society, personal integrity, consent, and distributive justice. Each article presents a specific ethical argument or position and forms a basic and important contribution to the discussion of a particular problem area. The issues covered are classed under seven headings: Abortion, Severely-Handicapped Children, Death and Dying, Research and Human Experimentation, Genetic Engineering and Genetic Policy, the Allocation of Scarce Resources, and Behavior Modification.

In a review as short as this, little more can be done than highlight some of the most crucial problems considered by the authors. In relation to the abortion issue, Gregory Baum makes it clear that Christians of good faith can be found on both sides of the issue. As an ecumenical theologian, he urges Catholics to respect the Protestant-Christian pro-abortion position as an attempt to deal in a Christian way with a difficult moral problem. Sissela Bok draws up some tentative guidelines of factors to be weighed by a person considering an abortion. Agonizing moral and

ethical decisions must be made in dealing with the problem of the mentally and physically defective neonate. Does the sanctity-of-life ethic require all life to be preserved as long as possible, regardless of its quality? How should the decision to stop treatment be made and who should make it? Similar questions must be resolved in determining when human death takes place. In the light of medicine's increasing ability to maintain certain signs of life artificially and to make good use of organs from newly-dead bodies, is there a need for a new 'definition of death'? While the criteria formulated by an Ad Hoc Committee of the Harvard Medical School have gained wide acceptance, two crucial questions have surfaced: Ought the public to be involved in 'defining death'? If so, how? Hans Jones discusses the complex issues connected with the problem of human experimentation, and notes that such experimentation for whatever purpose is always a responsible nonexperimental, definitive dealing with the subject himself, and not even the noblest purpose can abrogate the obligations this involves. One of the most common, as well as one of the most difficult, problems in medical ethics is that of the allocation of scarce resources. There is almost general agreement that comprehensive health services should be assured to every person irrespective of income or geographic location. The distribution of scarce resources, however, is another matter. Various criteria for distributing such resources are considered by Gene Outka who concludes that "to each according to his (essential) needs" is most in line with the Christian concept of charity.

Advances in biology and medicine indicate that the power to modify and control the capacities and activities of man by direct intervention and manipulation of their bodies and minds will soon be a reality. This power of "human engineering" will undoubtedly have profound social consequences, but still to be given adequate consideration are the questions raised by the new technology concerning ends, values, and standards. What ends will the new technique serve? What is a good man? What is a good life for man? What is a good community? The technique of transplantation raises the problem of how to meet the scarcity of organs and tissues for transplant purposes. Dr. Willard Gaylin suggests "Harvesting the Dead" by declaring persons with a flat EEG to be legally dead and then maintaining them on respirators for purposes of experimentation, transplantation, etc. Is revulsion to this new technology simply the fear and horror of the ignorant in the face of the new, or is it one of those components of humanness needed to sustain man at a level above the animal? Other questions are raised by the power of psychiatrists to control or modify human behavior. Is such treatment permissible without the person's consent? Is it always permissible even with the person's consent? How valid is consent given under duress? Do we have the right, even if we have the technology, to alter human beings in a way that seriously impairs their ability to choose? Still another problem involves scientific research vs. the right of the individual to privacy. Finally, the use of advanced electronic monitoring equipment to maintain and control human behavior leads to a variety of ethical questions: who will be controlled? who will exercise control? Most important of all, toward what end or what purposes, in pursuit of what values, will control be exercised?

This is an excellent book which should be on the shelf of every person concerned about the future of man. Technology is with us and there is no possibility of halting its advance, even if it were desirable to do so, but the welfare of man demands that we take time and effort to consider its goals and to direct it into the proper channels. The most important factor to keep in mind is that while there are many elements over which man can exercise no control, there are many others which he can control — and for these, he is responsible and stands accountable before God and man.

— Sister Priscilla Snell, O.P.