

## Tekst 9

### Just how vital are your organs?

... but kidney doctoring is bad  
by Barbara Gunnell

- 1 A delicate business, medical ethics, and the International Forum for Transplant Ethics was wise to observe a long period of silence on the sale of organs for transplant after the Turkish kidney donor scandal of the Eighties. But time is a great healer (though less so if you've had one of your kidneys stolen), and the Forum now wants to re-examine the rights and wrongs of rich people buying the kidneys of poor people.
- 2 'Most people will recognise in themselves the feelings of outrage and disgust that led to an outright ban on kidney sales ... Nevertheless, we need better reasons than our own feelings of disgust ... if we are to deny treatment to the suffering and dying,' wrote members of the Forum in *The Lancet*<sup>3)</sup> last week.
- 3 Let's just recall the disgust and outrage that are not good enough reasons. A lucrative trade in the kidneys of impoverished Turks was exposed in our very own Harley Street<sup>4)</sup>. The gaff was blown when one poorly Turk had to carry his even more poorly compatriot out of the private clinic that had purchased their kidneys for £3,000 and resold them for at least 10 times that.
- 4 Called before the General Medical Council to defend their trade, doctors said they had thought all the impoverished Turkish donors they saw were volunteer relatives of the wealthy recipients, who, strangely, were Greek, Israeli, Libyan – every nationality but Turkish. 'One almost has to make an effort to be as unwitting as this. How many Turks

were going to come along not speaking the same language before you were going to ask the question?!' one member of the General Medical Council asked a doctor.

- 5 Unabashed, the dog now returns to its vomit.
- 6 'The best way to address such problems would be by regulation and perhaps a central purchasing system, to provide screening, counselling, reliable payment, insurance and financial advice,' write the ethical experts, concluding with a flourish that 'feelings of repugnance cannot justify removing the only hope of the destitute and dying.'
- 7 The logic here is a bit assailable (we could, for example, look for better ways of helping the destitute than dismantling them). None the less the doctors are right that a shortage of kidneys for transplant is causing suffering and death – as well as a substantial loss of profits, with an estimated 38,000 patients waiting for kidneys in the United States alone.
- 8 So what have we, the squeamish, to offer as a solution? Human rights considerations militate against regularising the illicit but flourishing trade in the organs of executed Chinese prisoners: livers for \$40,000, kidneys for \$20,000, guaranteed non-smoker lungs, etc. One might find the number of executions rising uncannily.
- 9 But consider: the destitute and dispossessed, with their inadequate diets and degraded environments, need both their poison filters. The rich, with their sanitised lives and Perrier water, can easily get by on just one. Doctors seem confident that removal is a simple risk-free operation. We suggest they lead the way – make donating a kidney part of the rite of passage for all doctors entering private practice.
- 10 No cash, no ethical dilemma.

*'The Observer', June 28, 1998*

noot 3

*The Lancet*: a British medical journal

noot 4

Harley Street: a London street with a large concentration of private medical practices

## ■ Tekst 9 Just how vital are your organs?

- 1p **33**  Welke ethische kwestie stelt Barbara Gunnell aan de orde in haar artikel? Formuleer je antwoord in de vorm van een vraag.
- 1p **34**  Wie worden bedoeld met ‘the suffering and dying’ in alinea 2?
- In alinea 3 laat Barbara Gunnell zich kritisch uit over Harley Street.
- 1p **35**  Waarop komt haar kritiek neer?
- 1p **36** ■ Which of the following is made clear in paragraph 4?
- A Cultural and linguistic barriers prevented effective communication between doctors and patients.
  - B Doctors could not be expected to concern themselves with their patients’ personal histories.
  - C The argument doctors used to justify their practices cannot be taken seriously.
- 1p **37**  Wat wil Barbara Gunnell duidelijk maken met ‘the dog ... vomit’ (alinea 5)?
- 1p **38** ■ How can ‘as well ... alone’ (end of paragraph 7) be characterised?
- As showing
- A Barbara Gunnell’s compassion with poor people who would trade their kidneys for money.
  - B Barbara Gunnell’s concern about the number of people waiting for a kidney transplant.
  - C Barbara Gunnell’s doubt about doctors’ concern over people who need a transplant.
- ‘One might ... uncannily.’ (laatste zin alinea 8)
- 1p **39**  In welk geval zou dit kunnen gaan gebeuren?
- 1p **40** ■ Which of the following is true for paragraph 9?
- A It cynically generalises the issue discussed.
  - B It is an urgent appeal to doctors to get personally involved.
  - C It paints a hopeful picture for people needing a kidney transplant.
  - D It sarcastically offers an absurd solution to the issue discussed.
  - E It strongly stresses the need for more donors to come forward.