


Edited by

Lorry R. Frankel, Amnon Goldworth,
Mary V. Rorty, and William A. Silverman

Ethical Dilemmas in Pediatrics

Cases and Commentaries



CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDGE

more information - www.cambridge.org/9780521847445

This page intentionally left blank

Ethical Dilemmas in Pediatrics

Cases and Commentaries

Children in precarious health present particular problems for healthcare professionals because of their intimate relation to their family, and because of the family's need to provide major long-term support and to be actively involved in the decisions about their children's care. This collection of cases and commentaries in pediatrics highlights the difficult ethical dilemmas that can arise during high-tech hospital care of children in precarious circumstances. It serves as a teaching tool for clinical ethics, as an introduction for medical students and residents, and as a review for practicing physicians. Clinical cases are described in detail by the physicians involved, who focus on the ethical issues arising during treatment. Each case is then commented on in detail by a philosopher or other bioethicist. It thus serves as an introduction to contemporary clinical bioethics, but with a firm grounding in the practicalities of real-life pediatric care in the hospital setting.

Ethical Dilemmas in Pediatrics

Cases and Commentaries

Edited by

Lorry R. Frankel

Amnon Goldworth

Mary V. Rorty

and

William A. Silverman



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521847445

© Cambridge University Press 2005

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provision of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published in print format 2005

ISBN-13 978-0-511-11522-6 eBook (EBL)

ISBN-10 0-511-11522-9 eBook (EBL)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-84744-5 hardback

ISBN-10 0-521-84744-3 hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this book, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Every effort has been made in preparing this book to provide accurate and up-to-date information which is in accord with accepted standards and practice at the time of publication. Although case histories are drawn from actual cases, every effort has been made to disguise the identities of the individuals involved. Nevertheless, the authors, editors and publisher can make no warranties that the information contained herein is totally free from error, not least because clinical standards are constantly changing through research and regulation. The authors, editors and publishers therefore disclaim all liability for direct or consequential damages resulting from the use of material contained in this book. Readers are strongly advised to pay careful attention to information provided by the manufacturer of any drugs or equipment that they plan to use.

Contents

<i>List of contributors</i>	page	viii
<i>Preface</i>		xi
<i>Introduction</i>		1

Part I **Therapeutic misalliances**

1.1	Unconventional medicine in the pediatric intensive care unit Chester J. Randle Jr.	13
1.2	Role responsibility in pediatrics: appeasing or transforming parental demands? Richard B. Miller	21
1.3	Topical discussion	30
2.1	The extremely premature infant at the crossroads Ronald Cohen and Eugene Kim	34
2.2	The extremely premature infant at the crossroads: ethical and legal considerations Simon N. Whitney	37
2.3	Topical discussion	52
3.1	Munchausen syndrome by proxy Manuel Garcia-Careaga and John A. Kerner Jr.	55
3.2	Some conceptual and ethical issues in Munchausen syndrome by proxy Frances M. Kamm	67
3.3	Topical discussion	80

Part II **Medical futility**

4.1	Letting go: a study in pediatric life-and-death decision making Lawrence H. Mathers	89
4.2	Near-drowning, futility, and the limits of shared decision making Simon N. Whitney	95
4.3	Topical discussion	108
5.1	Long-term ventilation in a child with severe central nervous system impairment Ronald M. Perkin, Robert Orr, and Stephen Ashwal	113
5.2	Autonomy, community, and futility: moral paradigms for the long-term ventilation of a severely impaired child Anita Silvers	119
5.3	Topical discussion	131
6.1	Complexities in the management of a brain-dead child Lorry R. Frankel and Chester J. Randle Jr.	135
6.2	The moral arena in the management of a brain-dead child Amnon Goldworth	140
6.3	Topical discussion	148

Part III **Life by any means**

7.1	Where should a child die? Roger Burne	157
7.2	Where should a child (in the USA) die? William A. Silverman	162
7.3	Topical discussion	166
8.1	Infant heart transplantation and hypoplastic left heart syndrome: what are the ethical issues? Clifford Chin	170
8.2	Infant heart transplantation and hypoplastic left heart syndrome: a response Joel E. Frader	177

8.3	Topical discussion	185
9.1	Liver and intestinal transplantation Manuel Garcia-Careaga, Ricardo Orlando Castillo, and John A. Kerner Jr.	190
9.2	Transplantation and adolescents Rosamond Rhodes	196
9.3	Topical discussion	212

Part IV **Institutional impediments to ethical action**

10.1	Ethical problems encountered with oncology and bone marrow transplant patients Lorry R. Frankel and Joseph V. DiCarlo	221
10.2	Ethics in the pediatric intensive care unit: oncology and bone marrow transplant patients Linda Granowetter	229
10.3	Topical discussion	236
11.1	Nursing perspectives on withholding food and fluids in pediatrics Joy Penticuff	239
11.2	Ethics and clinical decision making: withholding food and information Mary V. Rorty	246
11.3	Topical discussion	253
12.1	Ethics and managed care Douglas S. Diekema	257
12.2	Challenging fidelity: the physician's role in rationing Nancy S. Jecker	267
12.3	Topical discussion	277
	<i>References</i>	282
	<i>Index</i>	296

Contributors

Stephen Ashwal, M.D.

Department of Pediatrics, Division of Child Neurology, Loma Linda University Adventist Health Sciences Center, Loma Linda, California 92350, USA

Roger Burne, M.B., B.S.

St. Bartholomew's Medical Centre, Cowley Rd, Oxford OX4 1XB, UK

Ricardo Orlando Castillo, M.D.

Department of Pediatrics, Division of Gastroenterology, Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, Palo Alto, California 94304, USA

Clifford Chin, M.D.

Department of Pediatrics, Division of Pediatric Cardiology, Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, Palo Alto, California 94304, USA

Ronald Cohen, M.D.

Division of Neonatal and Developmental Medicine, Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, Palo Alto, California 94304, USA

Joseph V. DiCarlo, M.D.

Department of Pediatrics, Division of Critical Care Medicine, Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, Palo Alto, California 94304, USA

Douglas S. Diekema, M.D.

Department of Emergency Services, Children's Hospital and Medical Center, Seattle, Washington 98105, USA

Joel E. Frader, M.D.

General Academic Pediatrics, Feinberg School of Medicine, 700 West Fullerton Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60614, USA

Lorry R. Frankel, M.D.

Department of Pediatrics, Division of Critical Care Medicine, Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, Palo Alto, California 94304, USA

Manuel Garcia-Careaga, M.D.

Department of Pediatrics, Division of Gastroenterology, Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, Palo Alto, California 94304, USA

Amnon Goldworth, Ph.D.

Senior Medical Ethicist in Residence, Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, Palo Alto, California 94304, USA

Linda Granowetter, M.D.

Columbia University Pediatric Oncology, 161 Fort Washington Avenue I-7, New York, New York 10032, USA

Nancy S. Jecker, Ph.D.

Department of Medical History and Ethics,
School of Medicine, University of
Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195,
USA

Frances M. Kamm, Ph.D.

Kennedy School of Government,
Harvard University, 79 JFK Street,
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138,
USA

John A. Kerner, Jr., M.D.

Department of Pediatrics, Division of
Gastroenterology, Lucile Packard
Children's Hospital, Palo Alto,
California 94304, USA

Eugene Kim, M.D.

Chief of Neonatology, Santa Clara Valley
Medical Center, 751 Bascom Avenue,
San Jose, California 95128, USA

Lawrence H. Mathers, M.D., Ph.D.

Department of Pediatrics, Division of
Critical Care Medicine, Lucile Packard
Children's Hospital, Palo Alto,
California 94304, USA

Richard B. Miller, Ph.D.

Poynter Center for the Study of
Ethics and American Institutions, Indiana
University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405,
USA

Robert Orr, M.D., C.M.

Director of Clinical Ethics, University of
Vermont College of Medicine, Burlington,
Vermont 05405, USA

Joy Penticuff, Ph.D., R.N., F.A.A.N.

School of Nursing, University of Texas at
Austin, Austin, Texas 78701, USA

Ronald M. Perkin, M.D.

Department of Pediatrics, Brody School of
Medicine, East Carolina University,
Greenville, North Carolina 27834, USA

Chester J. Randle, Jr., M.D.

Department of Pediatrics, Kaiser
Permanente, Oakland Medical Center,
280 West MacArthur Boulevard, Oakland,
California 94611, USA

Rosamond Rhodes, Ph.D.

Director of Bioethics Education, Mount
Sinai School of Medicine, One Gustav Levy
Place, New York, New York 10029, USA

Mary V. Rorty, Ph.D.

Stanford University Center for Biomedical
Ethics, 701 Welch Road, Suite 1105,
Palo Alto, California 94304, USA

William A. Silverman, M.D.

Professor of Pediatrics (retired), Columbia
University College of Physicians & Surgeons,
New York 10032, USA

Anita Silvers, Ph.D.

Department of Philosophy, San Francisco
State University, 1600 Holloway Avenue,
San Francisco, California 94132, USA

Simon N. Whitney, M.D., J.D.

Department of Family and Community
Medicine, Baylor College of Medicine,
3701 Kirby Drive, Suite 600, Houston,
Texas 77098, USA

Preface

The editors would like to offer their thanks to the authors of the chapters in this book for their thoughtful contributions. Inheritors of a long tradition of silent service, they have been willing to add their voices to an ongoing dialogue between providers of and observers of medical care in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, for which we are grateful.

The children and the families for whom we have had the privilege of caring during their various illnesses are honored as well in these pages, though the details of the cases have been changed by the authors to prevent any identification of particular patients.

Although it is the physician's voice that is most often heard in this volume, we gratefully acknowledge that the work of the hospital involves many helping professions, including nurses, therapists, chaplains, social workers, and clinical ethicists.

The areas of pediatric medicine and of medical ethics have been impoverished by the loss of William A. Silverman, who died as this volume was in preparation.

The book has been greatly helped by the thoughtful comments of anonymous reviewers and the scrupulous and authoritative editorial work of Hugh Brazier, and is dedicated to our families, who support our work, and to the children.

Introduction

Medicine, dealing as it does with human beings when they are most vulnerable, is a combination of science, technology – and ethics. All human action has ethical implications, and this book is an exercise in making explicit the ethical implications of action by practicing physicians and other clinicians in the context of a particularly vulnerable population, the infants and children in pediatric medical practice. The book is aimed at several possible audiences, including the primary-care providers who care for children with a high mortality risk or the potential for significant debilitating morbidity, and the physicians in tertiary-care institutions, for whom the clinical scenarios described will sound very familiar. It can serve as a case collection for ethics education of ethics committee members, medical students, and residents. But it is hoped that it will be useful as well to those non-medical professionals who play a role in the ethical life of healthcare institutions, or to lay people who have reason to seek to learn more about the specialized and sometimes confusing world of high-tech care for seriously ill children and the thoughtful and well-intentioned healthcare professionals who wrestle with ethical issues in that world.

To maximize its usefulness to this variety of possible constituencies, the editors have chosen a case and commentary format, asking physicians (and in one case a nurse) to provide detailed clinical accounts of cases in their practice which presented perplexing ethical issues. We have then matched each case with a bioethicist, asking for an ethical commentary on the issue which seems most salient to the respondent, on the basis of the description given by the clinician. With each chapter the editors have included short discussions of ethical issues raised by or discussed in the case and commentary, including references for further reading in the medical and bioethics literature.

There is considerable variation in the way the cases are presented, reflecting different styles of case review. While the degree of attention to blood chemistry or particular pharmaceuticals in some cases may be bewildering to the non-clinician, it is attention to such empirical details that reveals the clinical picture to the physician;

and the ethical dimensions of a medical case are implicated by the clinical picture. Predictive clinical data provide the context in which value judgments are made about whether or not a medical intervention counts as a viable therapeutic option. Non-clinicians seeking to improve their familiarity with clinical culture will find the meticulous medical detail and attention to context of the clinical cases an illuminating change from the often schematic and spare examples typical of many introductory bioethics texts.

It is not surprising that many of the cases feature hard decisions around care at the end of life. Such cases are memorable, conflicted, and complex, and often incorporate tacit or explicit conflicts of obligation, of commitment, and of loyalty. Sometimes no good can be obtained without forgoing another good; sometimes the only choice is between equally bad options. The high emotions, the clinical unpredictability, and the heightened impact of decisions at the end of life can contribute to turning a clinical crisis into an ethical one. While this concentration on the frontiers of medical practice makes some ethical issues very salient, it remains true that the same range of issues arise in many more familiar cases drawn from primary-care practice, where the stakes may be as high and the consequences as tragic for patients and their families.

Pediatric medicine

Pediatric clinical ethics is to be distinguished from general clinical ethics for several reasons. Pediatric medicine must take account of a three-way relationship, involving physician, patient, and family (normally the parents) rather than the dyadic relation that is more typical in adult medicine. The adult patient can participate in the decision-making process. While husband or wife, mother or father may have an advisory role in determining treatment strategies, the adult patient has the final say in consenting to treatment. By contrast, in the pediatric setting the parents are usually the consenting parties. The pediatrician is thus more explicitly responsible to the parents than the oncologist or internist typically is to the family members of his or her adult patient.

Adult medicine also may deal with incapable patients – with individuals incapacitated by age, disease, or injury, as well as nominally adult patients who have for various reasons never attained capacity. For previously capable patients there is some possibility of considering what their treatment preferences might have been were they not incapacitated. Advance directives, previously expressed opinions, or remembered discussions give clues for surrogates attempting to exercise substitute judgment for now-incapable adults. The question of surrogate decision making for pediatric patients has different parameters. “Precedent autonomy” of the sort invoked by some writers in connection with treatment decisions for Alzheimer’s

patients (Dworkin 1993) is not available for very young infants, who have had no opportunity to form patterns of preference or to indicate their wishes. The only possibility is to invoke something like “precursor autonomy”: to recognize that the presently incapable child is potentially a capable future person for whom the maximum of available options should be held open.

Such considerations, except for adolescent patients, are typically “best interests” judgments, not substitute decision making. One commentator has suggested that while respect for patient autonomy is the governing value in adult medicine, in pediatric medicine the duty of beneficence takes precedence over autonomy. Thus professionals may presume to protect or promote the patient’s welfare with fewer limits on their authority than in the case of adult medicine (Miller 2003: 2).

All physicians seek to satisfy the best interests of the patient. When that patient is a minor, a helpless and vulnerable child, the importance of protecting those interests is particularly pressing. At the same time, the pediatric physician, more than many of his or her peers, must consider the situation, the interests, and the preferences of the family as part of the agenda. The child’s interests cannot be viewed in isolation from the family, for it is the family that typically forms the major enduring and sustaining context for the child. The possibility of a conflict between the child’s best interest and the family’s best interest adds a dimension when ethical issues arise in the care of children. In cases where there is a clear conflict, such as parental abuse, negligence, or requests by parents for non-beneficial treatment, the professional duty to the child takes precedence, despite practical difficulties that arise in obtaining alternatives to the parents as advocates for the child. Pediatric medicine is an exercise in psychosocial, as well as technical medical, expertise.

Medical ethics, clinical ethics, bioethics

Healthcare organizations and the professionals employed or contracted with them have generally relied on professional or clinical ethics to provide guidance for difficult decisions. Physicians, nurses, and hospital administrators all operate under professional codes which are “Hippocratic” – that is, they acknowledge the primacy of the welfare of the patient as the governing value of their functions. The same is true of other health professionals. Professional ethics is fundamental to the dyadic relationship of the patient and the responsible physician, and enjoins honesty, confidentiality, attention to technical competence and good character, and advance of medical knowledge. Medical ethics is an important part of the education and professional socialization of medical professionals.

Clinical ethics, a patient-centered application of biomedical ethics, has developed for dispute resolution and mediation in clinical settings. A relative newcomer

to the medical context, clinical ethics is premised on the assumption that people with a variety of professional (or personal) perspectives and roles may have an equal moral stake in the care of a particular patient, and need to have their voices heard in making treatment decisions in conflicted or ethically complex cases. This development has several roots. It is partially a result of a growing consumer activism that has extended into many areas, having as one result attention to patients' (and families') rights. It is responsive as well to shifts in healthcare delivery. Health care in the last few decades in the United States has increasingly been delivered through a team model in complex institutions. When numerous clinicians and hospital personnel are directly involved in patient care, cases can arise where inadequate communication, conflicts between caregivers, or differences between family members about appropriate treatments can create impediments to or interruptions in the implementation of plans of care for individual patients. It has thus become a condition of accreditation for US hospitals of more than 200 beds to establish an "ethics process," typically an ethics committee, to advise in the adjudication of such disputes. Discussions of these individual clinical cases may involve informed-consent issues, life-and-death decision making, pain and suffering, and the uses of power in clinical settings, as well as such issues as communication, disclosure, and truth telling. Clinical ethics focuses on making differing perspectives explicit and, where possible and appropriate, working toward agreement on the proper priority of shared values. It is typically a multidisciplinary practice, involving physicians and nurses, but also clinicians from allied health professions, social workers, chaplains, sometimes lawyers with health-related specialties, and individuals from such academic disciplines as philosophy, religion, or the social sciences who have familiarized themselves with clinical medical practice. People who identify themselves as clinical ethicists are involved in education, institutional policy deliberations, and ethics consultation in healthcare organizations, contributing to hospital ethics committees and engaging in discussion with clinical practitioners about ethical issues which arise in practice settings. Clinical ethics has been described as "a bridge between the clinical world of health care practice and the theoretical disciplines of bioethics and medical humanities in the academic world" (Fletcher *et al.* 1997: 7). Many of the chapters make reference to the presence and involvement of ethics committees in the cases discussed.

Bioethics as a social movement and academic practice has developed rapidly since the early 1970s. It is to some extent misleading to suggest that bioethics is a discipline. It is more properly described as a multidisciplinary research and practice, involving individuals with many different academic and professional backgrounds. Some sociologists, anthropologists, and historians, some philosophers, nurses, and theologians, some biologists, lawyers, and many physicians, draw upon and contribute to the burgeoning literature of bioethics. Nor is it solely theoretical. One scholar, contrasting bioethics with clinical ethics, characterizes bioethics as "greatly

concerned with public policy issues” (Siegler 1979: 915), and in the USA as in many other countries one of the most visible forums for bioethical deliberation is in state- and federal-level bioethics commissions. The European Union and the United Nations have similar committees working on the international level.

When participating in policy or clinical discussions, participants with theological commitments may take those into consideration, just as lawyers may consider first the legal constraints or precedent cases. Philosophers who have turned their attention to bioethical issues, on either the policy or clinical levels, often have a temptingly rich body of philosophical ethical theorizing at their disposal. Those who prove most useful in those contexts, whatever their background, are able to draw from their areas of expertise elements which, when introduced into discussion, are able to broaden the range of issues under consideration, present perspectives that enlighten participants, and provide good reasons for one or another policy or course of action. In a pluralistic society the reasons that seem determinative for one participant or another, be they legal or theological, consequentialist or cultural, may be less persuasive to other affected parties. The purpose of a book on ethics and medical practice is not to provide definitive “right answers” that can silence dialogue, but to remind us that it is good reasons that provide both justification and motivation for action, and to encourage, and to illustrate, the search for reasons for treatment decisions.

Ethical approaches to clinical issues

There is a wide range of variation in the commentaries as well as in the cases, since the respondents come from different theoretical backgrounds and have a wide range of interests, reflecting the wide range of concerns in the changing field of bioethics. The commentators tend to be collaborators rather than critics, often tacitly entering into dialogue with the perplexities of the clinicians, or contributing their perspective with the freedom that can come from being an observer, rather than a participant. Philosophers predominate among the respondents, but clinical and legal training have also informed various commentaries.

Opening a dialogue between medicine and bioethics requires choosing a common vocabulary in which the issues can be discussed, and as the various respondents interact with the descriptions of the cases provided by the physicians, different commentators choose different vocabularies. One might think of the different uses of ethical vocabulary as “styles” of reasoning – principlism, casuistry, narrative. The common discourse of legal obligations features in some of the commentaries. Other commentators, and some of the physicians as well, utilize the vocabulary of the bioethics principles introduced in the first bioethics commission report in 1982 – beneficence and non-maleficence, autonomy and justice – to illuminate aspects of the cases which seem particularly deserving of ethical attention

(President's Commission 1982). The "methods" debate in bioethics is reflected in the different styles of commentary, with some commentators utilizing, others criticizing, application of ethical principles to specific clinical cases. Though each response is quite specific, the editors hope that the cumulative effect will broaden readers' appreciation of the range of ethical concerns clinical cases raise, and the variety of approaches available to deal with those concerns.

Ethical deliberation arises when agents ask "what should I do?" In some unproblematic situations the answer may be "whatever I can." In other situations agents may have cause to wonder whether something within their power is nevertheless a less preferable option, or find themselves wrestling with the consequences of doing their best. It is such cases that fill the following pages. In problematic situations, decision makers find themselves asking: What are the risks and benefits of each alternative? What are the rights of the individuals involved? How are the benefits and burdens of each possible course of action distributed (Foreman and Ladd 1991: 2–3)?

There is one consistent feature of the vocabulary, and of the concerns, of actors and commentators in the cases discussed: a recognition of the extent to which medical intervention, especially, if not uniquely, in pediatrics, is also an intervention into the varied, complex, and intimate arena of family relationships. The presumption, usually justified, is that parents have their children's best interests at heart, and are exercising affection and knowledge, as well as authority, over their children's lives. Anything that impacts the most vulnerable member affects the entire family, and this recognition permeates the book.

The complexity of the relation of children to their families in the light of third-party interventions, especially, although not only, medical interventions, has been the subject of considerable recent discussion. Contemporary liberal society has been characterized by a great emphasis on privacy and individual rights. Various critics, including feminists, communitarians, and disability-rights advocates, have complained that the liberal ideal insufficiently values intimate relations and devalues lives that include as central components various kinds of dependencies and interrelations. Several recent books have attempted to deal in detail with the relation of parental rights and family privacy to the general social and the specific medical obligations to protect the welfare of children, seeking to find a balance between acknowledgment of the importance of the family to the growing child, and the recognition that as a person-in-process the child may have some needs and interests other than those provided by the family (Nelson and Nelson 1995, Ross 1998, Miller 2003).

There is no doubt that the changing conditions of healthcare delivery in the United States, including the growth of managed care and the increasing emphasis on cost-containment and efficiency, is having an impact upon clinical medicine and