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Abstract: The essay briefly looks into the bioethical guide of extreme triage and resource allocation based on known co-morbidities (i.e., obesity, hypertension, and diabetes). I invite to reflect upon how a focus on individual responsibility under COVID-19 occludes major structural problems while silencing the social factors behind the health disaster that we are witnessing today. The essay argues that chronic diseases are not merely the result of genetic makeup or individual choices but are instead profoundly linked to poverty, systemic racism, structural violence, and lack of care. Debates on extreme triage guidelines and resource allocation illuminate a series of ethical shortcomings that preexisted COVID-19. Even if guidelines clearly state that criteria such as race, gender, or class will not be taken into account when deciding how to allocate limited medical resources, these categories are deeply linked to health disparities, and therefore, on people’s possibilities of surviving the pandemic.
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Assuming a shortage of medical resources to treat patients with Covid-19, many Latin American countries have discussed or established bioethical guidelines for limited resource allocation in the case of a public health emergency or what is known as ‘extreme triage.’ Under the principle of social justice, these guidelines propose to allocate resources to save as many lives as possible. Countries such as Chile, México, Argentina, Colombia, Brazil, and Uruguay have discussed the establishment of triage teams to administer scarce resources based on two main criteria: the possibility that a patient will improve and survive (that is, the presence vs. the absence of co-morbidities) and the time the patient will take to recover. In many countries, the additional recommended principle is to allocate resources to those who can have more years of life saved. That is, younger patients.

An emergency resource allocation strategy certainly involves abandoning the Hippocratic Oath, the idea of equality between people, and the sacredness of life. However, in a crisis like the one we are experiencing now, health professionals require direction to proceed in the event of facing limited resources in a scenario that seems inevitable. Bioethical procedures need to be discussed and agreed upon before impromptu and discretionary decisions are made by health professionals overwhelmed by the physical and emotional burden of the current crisis. Helen Ouyang, a New York emergency department doctor, vividly describes her experience in the midst of the pandemic as hospitals get flooded by patients, dead and alive. Her experience demonstrates the need for bioethical guidance on ‘extreme triage’ for those at the front of the pandemic risking their own physical and emotional lives to save the lives of others. However, there is also a need to question some of the assumptions behind these triage guidelines.

Bioethical triage guidelines have sparked a heated debate across the globe. Bioethicists have been accused of playing God by deciding who deserves the chance to live and who doesn’t. In many countries, public opinion has forced bioethicists to rewrite and retract many of the recommendations for limited medical resource allocation. Many complaints have been directed towards the utilitarian ethics that often inform ‘extreme triage’ guidelines that propose the allocation of scarce medical resources with the sole idea of saving as many lives as possible. The most prominent criticisms were focused on age discrimination.

For instance, in Mexico, some went as far as comparing the bioethical triage guidelines to Nazi’s atrocities against those perceived as old or ill. In Argentina, a group of bioethicists questioned age as a factor in decision making since a young individual can suffer from more severe pathologies than an older one, and therefore be less likely to survive the virus. In contrast to the outcry over what many perceived as age discrimination, little has been said about co-morbidities as a factor that would make someone less likely to survive. This is especially problematic as there is growing evidence to suggest that many chronic diseases are not merely the result of genetic makeup or individual choices but are instead profoundly linked to poverty, systemic racism, structural violence, and lack of care. Failing to look at the preexisting conditions of our health systems and the struggles of those suffering from chronic diseases before Covid-19 could easily imply that critical medical resources are denied to those for whom the state has already failed to protect. As Palmer suggests, when highlighting how wellness is increasingly being presented as a lifestyle choice, ‘even before the pandemic, they [the chronically ill] had been used to the medical system giving up on them before they were given a chance.’ Moreover, many of those that are being identified as particularly ‘at risk’ of Covid-19 are being denied the care they regularly receive as surgeons or hospitals find themselves overwhelmed by the Covid-19 crisis. Given the economic toll of the pandemic, it seems unlikely that health care systems around the world will be able to maintain [in many countries, already inefficient] pre-Covid-19 levels of care for patient groups.

As a society, we decide on the allocation of resources on a daily basis. Triage guidelines have merely illuminated a series of ethical shortcomings that preexist in the crisis. Even as guidelines state that criteria such as race, gender, or class will not be taken into account when deciding how to allocate limited medical resources, these categories are indeed involved in the configuration of health disparities, and therefore, on the likelihood of someone surviving the virus. Since 2015, Latin America has seen a severe increase in poverty rates and extreme poverty that directly affects health inequalities. Covid-19 has
exposed the extent of such inequalities across the Latin American region. For instance, there are disproportionate rates of infection and death among indigenous peoples. As of May 18th, there were up to 20,000 confirmed cases of Covid-19 among indigenous peoples from the Amazonia and in its 2,400 territories across eight countries. Black Brazilians are said to be 62 percent more likely to die from the virus than whites, not only because of unequal access to health services but also because of the close correlation between race and chronic diseases such as diabetes and hypertension. Women constitute up to 70 percent of health workers across the region; they are not only at the front of the pandemic but are also the target of attacks by those fearing contamination.

In some cases, domestic violence is taking more women’s lives than Covid-19, and women are disproportionately taking the burden of domestic and care work during lockdown. Finally, migrants, refugees, and displaced people are also being disproportionately affected by Covid-19, not only because of stigmatization in host countries but also because of the impact of border shutdowns that have left thousands of people trapped, without basic needs for survival. In the case of Mexico, people treated at a private hospital were said to be 60 percent less likely to die by COVID-19 than those in public health units. Up to 71 percent of COVID-19 fatalities were among people with the educational attainment of primary school or less (i.e., incomplete primary school, no studies), and up to 46 percent were retired, unemployed or part of the informal economy. As these numbers suggest, race, class, and other social factors are directly behind the devastating effects of COVID-19. A bioethical approach to the allocation of medical resources under Covid-19 must consider that many of the bodies marked as ‘more likely to survive the virus’ were previously configured by colonial histories of racism, violence, and dispossession. As Barnes et al. suggest, ‘care always has a past and how we respond to past injustices is one of the largest ethical questions we need to face.’ Bioethics must engage with our regional past to address our present and future practices of care.

Covid-19 doesn’t exist in isolation and requires that we consider social and structural conditions as preexisting and problematic. Some of these conditions are embodied by individuals (i.e., age or co-morbidities), but others are found in institutional practices and policy approaches. The tangled political and biological life that allows for the transference of democratic action to states of emergency. If medicine gets politicized, and finally, the increasing entanglement of political and biological life that allows for the transference of democratic action to states of emergency. If the state unaccountable for the political and social roots of health inequalities. This notion of the body as private or apolitical could also be behind the stigmatization and condescending practices that often occur when labeling whole groups of people as vulnerable. For instance, a private amusement park in the city of Monterrey, northeast Mexico, announced that people were allowed to occupy these spaces freely. This leads us to ask, to diagnose through sights, such as diabetes or hypertension, who or what are these businesses ‘protecting’? What forms and meanings the notion of ‘protection’ or ‘care’ take in these cases? We must be attentive to the way these notions are used and how they are heavily charged with complex and, sometimes, contradictory meanings.


When it comes to the current state of emergency, it is also crucial to think about new and old forms of power in the region and their potential impact when managing the administration of life under Covid-19. We must engage with a bio-
tical approach to the allocation of care not only in times of emergencies but through the everyday care responsibilities grounded in democracy. As Tronto13 suggests, ‘democracy is not simply giving people a voice. It is giving people a voice in the allocation of caring responsibilities’. Following a theoretical tradition that attempts to go beyond an autonomy-centered approach to bioethics, we must engage with a democracy centered on care, one that could genuinely grasp the particular caring needs and obligations of states during and after Covid-19. As Garland-Thomson13 suggests, disability bioethics reminds us of the need to transform medical subjects into political ones. Bioethical guides for extreme triage must acknowledge that decisions to allocate limited care during a health crisis are often shaped by past injustices and by the health inequalities that result from structural violence. It is only by accounting for those silenced and complex stories embodied by patients before arriving at the emergency room that we could truly engage with an ethical practice of care.
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