
PREFACE

THE CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION OF THIS BOOK

This book contains the materials from *Health Care Law and Ethics* (10th ed., 2024) that are focused on medical liability and treatment relationships. As the larger casebook enters its seventh decade, we pause to reflect on the remarkable metamorphosis of health care law from a subspecialty of tort law, to a mushrooming academic and practice field whose tentacles reach into myriad scholarly disciplines and areas of substantive law. This book's nine prior editions reflect important stages in this evolutionary growth. Health care law originated as a separate field of professional practice and academic inquiry during the 1960s, when this book was first published. Under the somewhat grandiose label of "medical jurisprudence," the primary focus at first was on medical proof in all kinds of criminal and civil litigation, on medical malpractice actions against physicians, and on public health regulation. The principal concern was how traditional bodies of legal doctrine and practice—such as criminal, tort, and evidence law—should apply in medical settings.

During the 1970s, bioethics became a major additional area of concern as a consequence of the right to die movement spawned by the *Quinlan* case, and the focus on individual autonomy contained in the informed consent doctrine and the landmark decision on reproductive rights in *Roe v. Wade*. Law courses during this and earlier periods were taught under the heading of "law and medicine."

In the 1980s, economic and regulatory topics formed the third component of health care law, as exemplified by the increasing application of antitrust laws to the health care industry and the growing body of legal disputes under Medicare and Medicaid. This newer dimension accelerated its growth into the 1990s with the spread of HMOs and other managed care organizations, which propelled various corporate and contractual restructurings. These newer topics found their way into courses described as "health law."

Early twenty-first century developments presented continuing challenges to each of these areas of health care law and ethics. Principally, the Affordable Care Act, whose importance reverberates throughout the field, ignited an explosion of interest in health care public policy, including issues of justice and equity. Biotechnology, consumer-driven health care, the opioid epidemic, gender identification, and bioterrorism are other examples of emergent issues that received increased attention in recent editions. As we approach this century's second quarter, legal and health policy repercussions from the catastrophic COVID-19 epidemic continue to loom large, and the Supreme Court's *Dobbs* decision reversing *Roe v. Wade* challenges a range of previous assumptions about foundational reproductive rights. At that same time, evolving social understandings regarding matters such as gender identification and structural racism, and fast-paced technical developments, such as artificial intelligence, pose new issues or call for reexamination of existing legal and policy norms.

This path of development has resulted in an academic discipline defined more by an accretion of topics drawn from historical events than by a systematic conceptual organization of issues. Each of the field's four major branches—malpractice, bioethics, public health, and financing/regulation—stands apart from the others and is thought to be dominated by a

distinct theme. The principal concern of malpractice law is quality of care; bioethics is concerned with individual autonomy, but increasingly also social justice; public health poses the rights of patients against the state; and the primary focus of financing and regulatory law is access to care and the cost of care. As a consequence, health care law has yet to become a truly integrated and cohesive discipline.¹ It is too much the creature of history and not of systematic and conceptual organization.

Throughout various editions, our major ambition in this book has been to improve this state of disarray. This field has reached a stage of maturity that calls for stepping back and rethinking how all of its parts best fit together as a conceptual whole. In our view that conceptual whole is best organized according to the fundamental structural relationships that give rise to health care law. These relationships are:

1. The patient/physician relationship, which encompasses the duty to treat, confidentiality, informed consent, and malpractice
2. State oversight of doctors and patients, which encompasses the right to die, reproductive rights, physician licensure, and public health
3. The institutions that surround the treatment relationship, encompassing public and private insurance, hospitals and HMOs, and more complex transactions and organizational forms

We develop the traditional themes of quality, ethics/justice, access, and cost throughout each of these three divisions. We also address cutting-edge and controversial topics such as health care reform, genetics, managed care, and rationing, but not as discrete topics; instead, we integrate these developments within a more permanent, overarching organizational structure, which is capable of absorbing unanticipated new developments as they occur.

In deciding which topics to present in each section and in what depth, our basic guide has been to focus on the essential attributes of the medical enterprise that make it uniquely important or difficult in the legal domain. Health care law is about the delivery of an extremely important, very expensive, and highly specialized professional service. If it were otherwise, this book would likely not exist. Some lawyers and scholars maintain that there is no unifying concept or set of ideas for health care law; instead, it is merely a disparate collection of legal doctrines and public policy responses, connected only by the happenstance that they involve doctors and hospitals in some way—much as if one had a course on the law of green things or the law of Tuesdays. It would be far more satisfying to find one or more organizing principles that explain not only what makes the disparate parts of health care law cohere, but also why that coherence distinguishes health care law from other bodies of integrated legal thought and professional practice.

We believe those organizing principles can, in part, be found in the phenomenology of what it is to be ill and to be a healer of illness. These two human realities are permanent and essential features that distinguish this field from all other commercial and social arenas. They permeate all parts of health care law, giving it its distinctive quality and altering how generic legal doctrine and conventional theories of government respond to its problems and issues. Health care law might still be worth studying even without these unique attributes of medical encounters, but it is much more engaging and coherent because of them. It is these attributes

1. This disarray is reflected by the ongoing confusion over competing names for the field. Although “law and medicine” and “health care law” appear to signify the same topic, the first term is understood to mean older style malpractice and patient care subject matter, and the second term is used to refer to newer economic, regulatory, and social issues. Paradoxically, whereas “health care law” and “health law” might be thought to signify somewhat different fields—with the latter not restricted to medical treatment and therefore encompassing public health issues—often these similar terms are taken to mean essentially the same thing.

that give rise to an interrelated set of principles that justify classifying health care law as a coherent and integrated academic and professional discipline. Elaborating this perspective, see Mark A. Hall, *The History and Future of Health Care Law: An Essentialist View*, 41 *Wake Forest L. Rev.* 347 (2006).²

Accordingly, we stress the essential attributes of medical encounters throughout these materials by incorporating insights from other academic disciplines and theoretical perspectives. Behavioral disciplines such as psychology, sociology, and anthropology help to illuminate the nature of medical knowledge and the lived experience of illness, dependency, and trust as they occur in real-life medical encounters. Findings from health services research published in the health policy literature create a stronger empirical and theoretical base for exploring health care law, one that better exposes its broad social impact. Analytical disciplines, such as economics and moral and political theory, create the foundation for understanding developments in financing, regulation, and bioethics. And, the perspectives of feminist, communitarian, and critical race theory demonstrate the limitations of conventional analytical models and help us understand how health care law must evolve to accommodate viewpoints and concerns that have been excluded in the past.

We intend that this book will continue to serve as both a teaching tool and an ongoing resource for conducting research in health care law. To that end, in addition to the bibliographic notes in each section, we have created a dedicated website to serve this book: health-law.org. It provides more extensive bibliographic sources, including a bibliography of resources and readings that relate to research in health care law generally. This website also extends the book's content with interesting background materials, updates of important events since publication, additional relevant topics that were excluded due to space constraints, and links to other internet resources.

Acknowledgments

This manuscript could not have been prepared without the diligent help of those students and staff who assisted us over the past few years (Adithi Ayer, Nicolas Pena Brown, Elizabeth Bryan, Grace Connelly, Hayden Cresson, Alex Kremer, Ryan Mayhan, Connor Morgan, Maya Smith, Liv Staff, Lisa Walters, Andrew Thompson, and Tyler Yoo), and without the superhuman patience of our families (who, curiously, wish to remain anonymous). We also thank the following authors and publishers, who granted permission to use each of the excerpts of copyrighted material in these readings.

Baker, Tom. *The Medical Malpractice Myth*. University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Bennett, Amanda. "End-of-Life Warning at \$618,616 Makes Me Wonder Was It Worth It."

Bloomberg.com, 4 March 2010, www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2010-03-04/end-of-life-warning-at-618-616-makes-me-wonder-was-it-worth-it. Reprinted with permission from Amanda Bennett.

Black, Bernard S., et al. *Medical Malpractice Litigation: How It Works, Why Tort Reform Hasn't Helped*. Washington, DC, Cato Institute, 2021. Reprinted with permission.

Bobinski, Mary Anne. "Autonomy and Privacy: Protecting Patients from Their Physicians."

University of Pittsburgh Law Review, vol. 55, no. 2, 1994. The University of Pittsburgh School of Law.

Cooper, Zack. "Consolidation and Corporate Ownership in Health Care." Written Testimony to Senate Finance Committee, June 2023.

2. This casebook's website, health-law.org, provides cites to additional discussion of the overall content of health care law and approaches to teaching and understanding it.

- Eddy, David M. *Clinical Decision Making from Theory to Practice: A Collection of Essays from the Journal of the American Medical Association*. Jones & Bartlett Learning, LLC, 1996. Reprinted with permission from David M. Eddy.
- Garnett, Richard W. "Why Informed Consent? Human Experimentation and The Ethics of Autonomy." *Catholic Lawyer*, Vol. 36, No. 4. St. John's University School of Law, 1996.
- Gawande, Atul. *Complications: A Surgeon's Note on an Imperfect Science*. Copyright © 2002 Picador.
- Gay, George W. "Suits for Alleged Malpractice." *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal*, Vol. 165. Massachusetts Medical Society, 1911.
- Geier, Peter. "Emerging Med-Mal Strategy: 'I'm Sorry.'" *National Law Journal*, 24 July 2006, www.law.com/nationallawjournal/almID/900005457977/. ALM Global, LLC.
- Goodman, John C., and Gerald L. Musgrave. *Patient Power*. Cato Institute, 1992.
- Jost, Timothy Stoltzfus. "The Necessary and Proper Role of Regulation to Assure the Quality of Health Care." *Houston Law Review*, vol. 25, 1988. University of Houston Law Center. Reprinted with permission.
- Laine, Christine. "Patient-Centered Medicine." *JAMA*, vol. 275, no. 2, 10 January 1996. American Medical Association.
- Macklin, Ruth. *Enemies of Patients*. Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Mehlman, Maxwell J. "Why Physicians Are Fiduciaries for Their Patients." *Indiana Health Law Review*, vol. 12, no. 1, 31 May 2015. IU McKinney School of Law.
- Mello, Michelle M. and Allen Kachalia. *Evaluation of Options for Medical Malpractice System Reform*. Report to the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, 2010
- Mello, Michelle M., Carly N. Kelly and Troyen A. Brennan. "Fostering Rational Regulation of Patient Safety." *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, vol. 30. Copyright © 2005 Duke University Press.
- Merrill, Thomas W., et al. *Health and Medical Reform in the United States: Ethical Questions and Concerns*. President's Council on Bioethics Staff Background Paper, 2008.
- Peters, Philip G., Jr. "The Quiet Demise of Deference to Custom: Malpractice Law at the Millennium." *Washington and Lee Law Review*, vol. 57, 2000. Washington and Lee University School of Law. Reprinted with permission from Philip G. Peters, Jr.
- Peters, Philip G., Jr. "The Role of the Jury in Modern Malpractice Law." *Iowa Law Review*, vol. 87, 2002. The University of Iowa College of Law. Reprinted with permission from the Iowa Law Review.
- Restatement of Torts, Third: Products Liability. Copyright ©1998 by the American Bar Association. Reprinted with permission. All rights reserved. This information or any portion thereof may not be copied or disseminated in any form or by any means or stored in an electronic database or retrieval system without the express written consent of the American Bar Association.
- Rhodes, Robert P. *Health Care Politics, Policy, and Distributive Justice*. SUNY Press, 1992. Reprinted with permission.
- Sawicki, Nadia N. "Character, Competence, and the Principles of Medical Discipline." *Journal of Health Care Law and Policy*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2010. University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law.
- Sawicki, Nadia N. "Ethical Malpractice." *Houston Law Review*, vol. 59, no. 5, 23 May 2022. University of Houston Law Center.
- Schneider, Carl E. "Bioethics with a Human Face." *Indiana Law Journal*, vol. 69, no. 4, 1994. Maurer School of Law: Indiana University Bloomington.
- Schuck, Peter H. "Rethinking Informed Consent." *The Yale Law Journal*, vol. 103, no. 4, January 1994. The Yale Law Journal Company, Inc. Reprinted with permission.

-
- Sepper, Elizabeth. "Conscientious Refusals of Care." *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. Health Law*, edited by I. Glenn Cohen et al., Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Somers, Herman Miles, and Anne Ramsay Somers. *Doctors, Patients, and Health Insurance*. Brookings Institution Press, 1961. Reprinted with permission.
- Wennberg, John E. *Tracking Medicine: A Researcher's Quest to Understand Health Care*. Oxford University Press, 2010.
- White, Joseph. *Competing Solutions*. Brookings Institution Press, 1995. Reprinted with permission.

Mark Hall
Nadia Sawicki
Mary Anne Bobinski
David Orentlicher
Glenn Cohen

July 2024

