

Adverse direction and older people: ethical challenge in the promotion of adverse direction in New Zealand

Adverse direction is a term used to describe a situation where a person is directed to act in a way that is contrary to their own interests or the interests of others. This is often done in the name of a higher authority or a greater good. In the context of New Zealand, adverse direction is often used to describe the actions of the government or other public bodies. This is a complex and often controversial issue, as it raises questions about the limits of state power and the rights of individuals. In this paper, we explore the ethical challenges posed by adverse direction in New Zealand, and discuss some of the ways in which these challenges can be addressed.

The ethical challenges posed by adverse direction in New Zealand are complex and often controversial. One of the main challenges is the tension between the interests of the state and the interests of individuals. On the one hand, the state has a duty to protect the public interest and to promote the common good. On the other hand, individuals have a right to autonomy and to be treated as ends in themselves, rather than merely as means to other ends. This tension is often reflected in the actions of the government, which may be required to restrict individual freedoms in order to promote the public interest. This is a difficult balance to strike, and it is often the source of ethical dilemmas for those who are involved in the promotion of adverse direction.

Another ethical challenge is the issue of transparency and accountability. When the government or other public bodies are directed to act in a way that is contrary to their own interests or the interests of others, it is important that they are held accountable for their actions. This means that they should be required to provide a clear and honest explanation of why they have taken these actions, and that they should be held responsible for the consequences of their actions. This is often a difficult task, as it may require the government to admit to mistakes or to acknowledge that they have acted in a way that is not in the best interests of the public. However, it is essential if we are to maintain trust in our public institutions and to ensure that they are acting in a responsible and ethical manner.

2 I
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

... .. I
... .. ;
... .. A
... .. f :
... .. (),
... ..
... .. f
... ..
... ..

f

I 1997 R S (N H D
C)
(GP) C 29 28 I

A
GP
F

T.1E T.Z(JT17.5T15.5(28.77() (;7)-602-64)TJ/T12(-56()5505.5(82;)-)T5T .0.955)

24. [Australas J Ageing](#) 2002;**21**:74–9.
25. [Nurs](#) 1995;**22**:547–55.
26. [BMJ](#) 1998;**317**:1334–5.
27. [et al.](#) [BMJ](#) 2010;**341**(4092).
28. [Advance Directives, Living Wills and Questions of Competence.](#) [1997.](#) [14](#) (2010).
29. [Am J Hosp Palliat Care](#) 2009;**26**:270–6.
30. [The 1996/97 New Zealand Health Strategy.](#) 1999.
31. [NZ Med J](#) 1997;**110**:335–6.
32. [A Profile of NZ General Practice.](#) 1998.
33. [et al.](#) Consultation length in general practice: cross sectional study in six European countries. [BMJ](#) 2002;**325**(7362):472.
34. [et al.](#) What influences individuals to engage in advance care planning? [Am J Hosp Palliat Care](#) 2010;**27**(5):1–7.
35. [JAMA](#) 2005;**294**:359–65.
36. [et al.](#) [Ann Intern Med](#) 1998;**122**:441–9.
37. [Protection of Personal and Property Rights Act 1988.](#) 1998.

Advancing Postgraduates. Enhancing Healthcare.

The **o u** **Jou** is dedicated to advancing the understanding of postgraduate medical education and training.

- Acquire the necessary skills to deliver the highest possible standards of patient care
- Develop suitable training programmes for your trainees
- Maintain high standards after training ends

Published on behalf of the fellowship for Postgraduate Medicine

postgradmedj.com



BMJ Journals



Advance directives and older people: ethical challenges in the promotion of advance directives in New Zealand

Phillipa J Malpas

J Med Ethics 2011 37: 285-289 originally published online February 27, 2011

doi: 10.1136/jme.2010.039701

Updated information and services can be found at:

<http://jme.bmj.com/content/37/5/285.full.html>

These include:

References

This article cites 24 articles, 6 of which can be accessed free at:

<http://jme.bmj.com/content/37/5/285.full.html#ref-list-1>

Email alerting service

Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article. Sign up in the box at the top right corner of the online article.

Topic Collections

Articles on similar topics can be found in the following collections

[End of life decisions \(ethics\)](#) (282 articles)
[End of life decisions \(geriatric medicine\)](#) (282 articles)
[End of life decisions \(palliative care\)](#) (282 articles)
[General practice / family medicine](#) (81 articles)

Notes

To request permissions go to:

<http://group.bmj.com/group/rights-licensing/permissions>

To order reprints go to:

<http://journals.bmj.com/cgi/reprintform>

To subscribe to BMJ go to:

<http://group.bmj.com/subscribe/>