

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on Give and take? Human bodies in medicine and research between April 2010 and July 2010. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

Grant Mackie

Question 1

Well I don't think so. Why should this be a question as a donation is a donation. The main thing is that the person who donates if they are happy with it all and the person who accepts it then if both are happy there seems no problem. It's stupid to get bogged down in theory and far out concepts.

Question 2

Well all body matter is special .The main core bottom line is. If it saves life or eases suffering then every material is special.

Question 3

Well some might say it's creepy harvesting body material from dead people but again saving a life should take priority and relief of suffering i. As long as the donor is dead and his/ her wishes are fulfilled, what's the problem. As for the living, if they are happy, great if not tough what matters are the wishes of the donor and the recipient.

Question 4

No real costs. No real risk. The benefits should be the preservation of human life.

Question 5

Well the costs should be to make any testing as safe as possible to the human who under takes the experiment and also have up to date scientific advice (from an independent expert) of the risks ie bad health etc to the human who trails anything. The Guinea pig should be made aware of the risks and relatives no pressure should be made and a very generous long term care and reward package should be installed to reward the Guinea pig trails anything. The reward to medicine is obvious.

Question 6

The research into germ / biological warfare unless it's agreed with the donor. In this case the donor must give permission.

Question 7

I would donate to save life and for medical research to save life but would want any research on germ warfare banned on my genetic material unless I gave written permission.

Question 8

Again if I thought it was of benefit to mankind I would, but I would want to know the remit and about it and about the medicine before it was tested.

Question 9

Respect and the wishes of the donor on who should get his / her donation.

Question 10

1. Benefit to the ill and the wishes of the donor 2. Wishes of the donor.

Question 11

Question 1. No. Question 2 Not really. Why should it.

Question 12

Question 1. No. Why should there be, my body is my body it's up to me what I do with it. I am not compelled to donate and resent any person or organization enforcing the harvesting of my body parts. Question 2. n/a

Question 13

No. Not at all. People should donate only if they want too and not be forced or assumed to be a party to any scheme by default.

Question 14

Yes we should try to meet demand. IVF is less important than a kidney transplant. IVF should be paid for in full (at cost price on the NHS) by any person unable to have children. To subsidise IVF is a waste of resources which could be better spent saving life. No one has ever died not being able to have kids.

Question 15

Yes. Most certainly. This makes very good sense. There is no sense to drag our heels over outdated norms or high ethical debates by doctors who spout abstract ideals of whats right and whats wrong as regards incentives to donate bodily material. Like they would know how hard up people get doctor's and consultants having salaries in excess of £250,000 and while ordinary folk exist on £50 a week. So how can they comment about day to day life. How can they dictate about the wrongs of payment, incentives when they are in full health and not desperate for say a life saving organ etc. Doctors have no right to do this.

Question 16

No. Life is life and not to pull out all the stops to save life and to maximise as many donations as possible is plainly wrong and immoral. The overriding concern should be and must be too save life, the relief of suffering no matter what it takes to do so.

Question 17

No. The only thing I would not help is donation of kidneys to people who are confirmed drug addicts, drunks and who have no intention of mending their ways.

Question 18

Yes, indirect compensation appeals to my sense of philanthropy and makes me more likely to donate, well being average I find the cost of funeral expenses a rip off and yet I do not wish to burden my family with them where as direct payment is slightly selfish, which in certain circumstances might be abused. However if it could be policed and done in a non destructive / exploitative way organs could be sold. Sold say only through a designated market place supervised by the GMC.

Question 19

All are valid in my eyes at the end of the day someone wants what i have so I think I am entitled to at least some recompense for time and trouble. That's only fair, it the end of the day I would have something someone else wants so why not have at least expenses plus time and trouble.

Question 20

Well we should explore every option. We should press forward with every option as regards body material whether it be paid, free funerals, expenses, free donations, opt in schemes not only human / pig donor parts ie hearts and also mechanical hearts as well as it's doubtful supply will ever outstrip demand. To adopt a one policy fits all is doing a disservice to waiting recipients. We must have a multi pronged approach.

Question 21

1, No except Mental disorder and low IQ. 2, All options should be on the table. Free donations paid "" " Cash incentives Opt in Free Funeral expenses A limited payments scheme for body material ie £50 per egg £50 sperm donations etc. Limited copyright financial reward in the development of products via donated body material from a donor or donors.

Question 22

Safe guards need to be introduced to interview the donor on different occasions to find out the truth. In the case of women donating and female children extra interviews are needed to be conducted away from family members in private. This would be best done by someone who is preferably trained in investigation ie. ex police and who has experience of their cultural back ground.

Question 23

No. The donor should be informed. Most would have no problem with giving permission. So a donator gives some bio material thinking it will save someone's life and it's decided or found that it's a rare type and just what the scientists at

some weapons lab are looking for and they would like to use as a component for a new weapon. So they use it. That's wrong morally and ethically. Wrong, yes in that case it is. They must approach the donator and ask permission for it to be used in such a way and also a financial reward should be made. Likewise if the genetic material is used commercially the donator should be contacted and asked for permission for it to be used and likewise a payment made.

Question 24

Yes. You have to be more alert to their needs if they are a relative in which case the main carer should have the final say as well as the child if it is able to understand.

Question 25

Question 1. (a) The family should respect the wishes of the deceased, they have no right to interfere. (b) The relatives have first refusal on what happens. Question 2. No

Question 26

The law is wrong. I own my body as well as all the organs and other bio material of my body ie sperm blood and genetic material. To whom does it belong when dead, it remains my property and while i am alive I have the right to dispense or have it used in whatever way i think fit. Just because I am dead doesn't make it ownerless like if you buy a car it becomes my property and after use just because it doesn't work doesn't mean it doesn't belong to me. The state has no right to my body, if I have not expressed how i want it disposed of, then it becomes the property of my next of kin. They can do what they want with it.

Question 27

Yes and why not it's my body. I feed it I live in it. And also lived in it. If I want it sold off for parts on death why should it not be possible to sell it to benefit someone else. I should also have the option to sell parts when alive (under a proper supervised and regulated organisation).

Question 28

Yes of course they should. They should trace the donors and give them financial reward, ie. money shares or better access to developed treatments. For too long these companies have wanted something for nothing and it's neither right nor ethical to reap rewards from a free donated bio material gene pool.

Question 29

Well of course the courts and governments have been reluctant to recognise any general form of property ownership in the human body and you know why, it's obvious it's connected to big business and interests. You wouldn't go into a shop buy a loaf of bread and then someone say you can eat the bread but the crumbs

belong to no one. A person should have all property rights over his or her body and their bio material.

Question 30

Well I just think that to listen to the ordinary man or woman in the street is far better than getting the so called elite to pontificate is much better. At least then you get a true picture.