



We are used to special interest groups requesting increased support, and we interpret such requests accordingly. However, to promote one intervention on ethical grounds must surely impose an ethical responsibility to consider the ramifications on others. This aspect seems to have been neglected in Weijer's analysis.

John Turnbull, MD
Division of Neurology
Department of Medicine
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ont.

Dr. Weijer argues eruditely for CPR when demanded by families as a matter of cultural and religious conscience. The force of his argument derives from his assertion that this is a contest of values between physicians who hold that such life is not worth living and family members who believe in its sanctity and require that all means be used to prolong it. While such conceptualization of a battle of beliefs may be forceful, it casts doubt on physicians' respect for life and advances a faulty construction of the rationale and motive supporting do-not-resuscitate (DNR) orders in such cases.

In Weijer's editorial, beneficence is correctly understood to be patient focused, subject to independent, verifiable clinical judgement and common sense, and applicable to a patient conceived as an intellectual, social and spiritual — and not merely physical — being. A patient irretrievably incapable of experience, such as a person in a PVS, cannot benefit. Just as the incapacity for conscious experience removes any burden of suffering that would proscribe CPR, so too it removes any hope of benefit that would prescribe it. Such patients are beyond benefit. Their physical existence is a necessary but insufficient ground for CPR. Prolonging unconscious life through aggressive medical treatment

could be considered one definition of "bad medicine."

As physicians, we do not seek to judge the worth of a life but to judge all life worthy. Rather than the "smuggling in" of the premise that "a permanently unconscious life is not worth preserving," DNR orders in cases of PVS respectfully and ethically reflect a clear commitment to medicine's time-honoured mandate to mend and a humble understanding of its limitations. This is the wisdom behind the joint statement's position on DNR in cases involving a PVS.

Bruce W. Jespersen, MD
Calgary, Alta.

Dr. Weijer argues reasonably for accepting a family's refusal of a DNR order because of strong religious beliefs about the sanctity of life and therefore about the value of preserving the life of a family member even if that person is permanently unconscious. He argues that the joint statement¹ is "neither ethically nor legally defensible" and "ought to be amended," since treatment of a patient in a PVS is considered "futile" and, according to the joint statement, the patient would be "unable to experience any benefit."

An alternative view would be that the joint statement is valid, but, in the absence of outcome probabilities, it must be interpreted together with the patient's and the family's values. If the case is interpreted by hospital staff who understand and defend the values of the patient and the family, not their own personal values, the case would not be considered futile. The patient would be considered to experience benefit because in this value system an unconscious life is worth preserving.

Paul Walker, MD
Grey Nuns Community Hospital
& Health Centre
Caritas Health Group
Edmonton, Alta.

Reference

1. Joint statement on resuscitative interventions (update 1995). *CMAJ* 1995;153(11):1652A-C.

Two of the major issues addressed in this editorial are worth amplifying. The first is the concept of whether a life is worth living. We must never accept the concept that *any* life is not worth living. Once we do, we are on a slippery slope. There is very little difference between someone who is in a vegetative state for 2 years and someone who is in a vegetative state for 2 years less a day. Once the principle of the sanctity of human life is ignored, there may be no stopping the trend: the religion of death becomes accepted.

The second issue concerns the controversy surrounding euthanasia, exemplified in the editorial by the example of an Orthodox Jew who believes in God. Human beings are not only body and soul, but also spirit. Unless this conceptualization is accepted we will never understand that even for someone in a PVS, the spirit still exists. We do not know whether or not such a person is receiving input through some of the senses. There have been reports of patients later able to describe in detail every word spoken in their presence while they were in a comatose state. Let us not play God. Let us maintain our traditional values and concepts. These values work.

William D. Gutowski, MD
Chilliwack, BC

[The author responds]:

Patients and their families should be neither offered nor allowed to demand CPR in all situations. Empirical work has identified circumstances in which CPR cannot restore cardiopulmonary function.¹ CPR may be withheld legitimately in such cases, and without the need to invoke the notion of medical futility, because