Balancing Death against Lesser Burdens: Philosophy, Psychology and Policy

Health policy-makers have to make difficult decisions about who to prioritize for care. The most commonly used principles for priority setting take one of two forms: either they tell policy-makers to maximize total health-related well-being in their population, or they tell them to improve overall population health while assigning somewhat more weight to improvements in the health of the worse off. Many philosophers have objected that such standard principles counterintuitively allow one person’s very severe burden, such as an early death, to be outweighed by a multitude of minor burdens, such as toenail fungus. There is, however, little evidence of the public’s views. I present novel survey evidence which suggests that a large share of people indeed do not think that death can be outweighed by a multitude of minor burdens. I argue that these findings suggest that the most commonly used priority-setting principles may lack legitimacy, and that alternative principles that limit the degree to which death can be outweighed by lesser burdens may be superior, because they have a reasonable basis and are more widely supported by the public.
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