

that there are good reasons to deprioritize merely statistical harms. This is because, as I show in my paper, the notion of a ‘statistical victim’ is ambiguous between various interpretations. I draw a distinction between ‘anonymous victims’ and ‘merely statistical victims’. I defend this distinction on two grounds. First, I argue that it is normatively attractive. Anonymous victims are morally alike identifiable victims and unlike merely statistical victims. Second, I argue that preliminary psychological evidence shows that decision-makers in fact treat anonymous victims differently from merely statistical victims.

In the last part of my paper, I return to examples of health priority-setting and show what my view implies about these examples. It turns out that my view constitutes a middle path. In some cases it vindicates the preference for prioritizing identifiable persons over statistical persons while in others it condemns such a preference.

186:poster POVERTY DISCRIMINATION

¹Bastian Steuwer*, ²Kasper Lippert-Rasmussen. ¹Center for Population-Level Bioethics; Rutgers University; USA; ²Aarhus University

10.1136/bmjgh-2022-ISP.H.8

This paper examines a paradox arising in connection with an underexamined form of discrimination: socioeconomic discrimination. Recent evidence from the United States suggests that discrimination on basis of social class in health care delivery is common. Patients from poorer backgrounds, for example patients receiving care paid for by welfare programs, receive lesser quality care. Should such class discrimination be legally regulated?

It is generally believed that economically left- and right-wing convictions can unite in condemning paradigmatic forms of direct and indirect discrimination, e.g., race/caste/sex discrimination. However, we challenge this picture. We argue that it is difficult to condemn paradigmatic forms of direct discrimination and at the same time embrace the sort of economically regressive policies that in effect amount to indirect discrimination against the poor. This includes the myriad of policies which exacerbate unfair social determinants of health ranging from housing policies, infrastructure policies, education policies to health policy. Our argument appeals to the fact that each of the following three claims seem appealing:

P1. Paradigmatic discrimination should be prohibited by law.

P2. If direct paradigmatic discrimination should be prohibited by law, then so should indirect paradigmatic discrimination.

P3. If indirect paradigmatic discrimination should be prohibited by law, then so should indirect socioeconomic class discrimination.

However, together they entail a very radical claim:

C. Hence, indirect socioeconomic class discrimination should be prohibited by law.

C would allow for substantial litigation on health policy and social policy more broadly – in effect it would allow for many policies causing social gradients in health outcomes to be challenged. Our main aim is not to defend C, but to show that we need to respond to it in one way or another which for many will require significant revisions of their beliefs.

140:poster THE ETHICS OF GLOBAL COVID-19 VACCINE ALLOCATION

¹Benjamin E Berkman*, ²Skye Miner, ¹Holly Taylor, ³Joseph Millum, ⁴Alex Iyer, ⁵Rebecca Kahn, ¹Annette Rid. ¹Department of Bioethics; National Institutes of Health; USA; ²University of Arkansas Medical School; ³University of St. Andrews; ⁴Harvard Medical School; ⁵Harvard School of Public Health

10.1136/bmjgh-2022-ISP.H.9

Introduction Policies to increase global vaccine access involve HICs making ethically fraught tradeoffs between saving lives at home or abroad. Such policies should be justifiable to the affected populations. Yet there is little robust data on whether HIC residents endorse their countries’ policy choices. Most existing data asks highly simplified questions, without providing background on the ethical tradeoffs involved. These data do not capture the public’s informed views, giving policymakers limited guidance on how to craft international vaccine policy. This paper provides the first nuanced data on the informed views of a representative sample of the U.S. public about providing COVID vaccine to poorer countries.

Methods This study involved two interventions: a description of ethical arguments for/against providing vaccine to poorer countries and visual depiction of ethically relevant tradeoffs about providing vaccine to poorer countries at different time points in the US vaccination campaign. A representative sample of 4000 U.S. adults were surveyed, divided evenly into four arms: 1) arguments only; 2) tradeoffs only; 3) both interventions; 4) no interventions.

Results Across all four arms, people are more willing to donate vaccines than previously reported, with generosity increasing over time. 43% of respondents were willing to share at an early timepoint when supply was extremely limited, increasing to 54% and 71% at intermediate and current timepoints, respectively. Some specific variables (e.g., political affiliation, age, acceptability of masks) were predictive of willingness to donate and endorsement of specific arguments.

Discussion These data can guide policy about providing or keeping U.S. vaccine doses as the world navigates the effects of new variants and the potential need for booster shots in the coming months. Given high levels of willingness to donate, U.S. policy could have initiated global vaccine donations earlier and could be more generous currently.

105:oral CLINICAL PRIORITY SETTING DURING THE COVID-19-PANDEMIC – NORWEGIAN DOCTORS’ EXPERIENCES

¹Berit Bringedal*, ¹Fredrik Bååthe, ¹Karin Isaksson Rø, ²Ingrid Miljeteig, ³Morten Magelssen. ¹Institute for Studies of the Medical Profession, Oslo, Norway; ²Department of Global Public Health and Primary Care, Bergen Centre for Ethics and Priority Setting (BCEPS), Bergen, Norway; ³Centre for Medical Ethics, Institute of Health and Society, University of Oslo, Norway

10.1136/bmjgh-2022-ISP.H.10

Introduction Although Norway had lower infection rates and fewer patients hospitalized during the first year of the covid-19 pandemic, measures taken to avoid anticipated pressure on health care involved hard priorities of patients and staff. How did doctors experience this situation? We studied doctors’ knowledge about, and adherence to, guidelines and regulations on priority setting, and whether the actual priorities were considered reasonable and justifiable.