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Background: Blood and plasma (b&p) are crucial but scarce resources for medical therapies. Collecting b&p poses technical and ethical challenges, as can be observed when it comes to regulation.

Objective: To provide ethical orientation for organizing and regulating the donation and collection of b&p.

Method: Analysis of ethical theories in regard to their potentials to reach the objective.

Results: The ongoing ethical debate between paid vs. unpaid b&p donation is shaped by a 'simple b&p ethics' approach that focuses on the individual donor and the existence or non-existence of one motivation: altruism. Utilitarian and deontological ethics come to different conclusions but basically apply the same simple approach. In contrast, forms of 'complex b&p ethics' acknowledge the ambiguity of altruism, try to find a common framework for the plurality of motives to give b&p (contractualism), or point out that giving b&p is part of a good life (virtue ethics). Complex b&p ethics furthermore widens the perspective from the individual donor to the collecting organization and the donation/collection regime and critically assesses them.

Conclusion: Neither 'gift fetishism' nor total commodification seem to be ethically sound ways of enabling people to live good lives. Those engaged in b&p collection will be well advised to acknowledge the complex plurality of motives while simultaneously upholding the caring nature of b&p donation, collection, and distribution.
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1. Introduction

Blood and plasma (b&p) are crucial but unfortunately scarce resources for medical therapies. Both attributes are of ethical interest. Ethics is addressing the questions: What shall we do facing a given situation? What are justifiable reasons to proceed in one way or the other? The answers and concepts ethics is providing then shape the normative framework of state or supranational legislation, executive regulations, and judicial cases. This pattern can easily be observed when it comes to b&p regulation in the European context [1,2].
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1.1. Objective of this paper

Having analyzed the ethical discourse concerning b&p collection, I have come to a differentiation between, what I would call, 'simple' and 'complex' b&p ethics that I will present in this paper. The research question investigated here can be formulated as follows: What normative orientation can ethics provide for the collection of blood or plasma?

In answering this question I will show that simple b&p ethics provides normative arguments why a person should give his or her blood or plasma and what criterions make this an ethically right or wrong action. Then I will argue that complex b&p ethics (a) acknowledges a pluralism of individual motives and (b) embeds the donor and his or her act of donation into a broader social context. By so widening the perspective, b&p ethics becomes more than the debate of ‘paid vs. unpaid’ donation—it becomes a matter of good life.

1.2. Consensual starting points

Before analyzing what simple and complex b&p ethics can tell us for shaping b&p collection and thereby also pointing out conflicting ethical answers, I regard it as useful to briefly state the most important consensual starting points.

First, it is a given fact that b&p are essential for therapies of patients with serious, often rare and chronic diseases and disorders. From an ethical point of view it is consented that helping these people with effective and efficient therapies is a moral imperative. How much and what kind of actions this imperative can justify is another question.

Second, it is also evident that b&p are scarce resources, meaning that there is more (and growing) demand of them than supply available. Unless it becomes possible to create b&p artificially or substitute them with other substances, b&p are examples of absolute scarcity. Acknowledging this fact, ethics generally demands that such resources be used responsibly and efficiently; rationalizing the use of b&p products during surgery may be an example of following this ethical demand. Moreover, ethics can justify efforts to expand the availability of b&p – but only prima facie because not all trade-offs are sound in all ethical theories (e.g., trade-offs between expanding the availability and respecting human rights would violate core principles of deontological ethics but may be justified from an utilitarian point of view).

Third, despite valid criticisms of some pharmaceutical industry practices, one has to acknowledge that collecting and manufacturing b&p are costly and complicated endeavors that are qualitatively different from other pharmaceutical productions. Recognizing this unique position of b&p pharmaceuticals, ethics can argue that b&p must be handled cautiously (think of all the safety issues), that the process must be facilitated by adequate regulations, and that burdens and benefits occurring in this process must be distributed fairly among all participants.
A final starting point concerns the question whether b&p are special materials. For many scientifically educated people who professionally handle b&p, it may be hard to imagine that a great share of the population still regards blood as a somehow special substance [3,4]. An awareness of this feature is also present among healthcare professionals, though [5]. Modern ethics has developed to critically enlighten mythological or magic perceptions of the world such as those of blood. However, ethics has to work with anthropological concepts and symbolisms of our human existence. Blood, in all its ambiguous meaning and notwithstanding scientific explanations, still can be regarded as such a core substance of life (shaping even important legal areas, e.g., by the principle of _ius sanguinis_ in some European states' citizenship laws). That biomedicine has yet not managed to reproduce blood only adds to its uniqueness. There is no direct ethical imperative following from this characterization of blood but it should be kept in mind as an underlying anthropological symbol when talking about or using b&p.

These four features may be regarded as starting points for further ethical discussions. In the following section, I will explain how different ethical theories come to different conclusions concerning b&p ethics.

2. Simple and complex b&p ethics: The donor

The first approach, 'simple b&p ethics,' focuses on the person who gives blood or plasma (for simplicity I will call this person 'donor' although the meaning of 'donating' is contested). Simple b&p ethics furthermore focuses on the existence or non-existence of one motivational feature: altruism. This finally leads to the fierce 'paid vs. unpaid' debate that has been going on since the 1970s [6,7].

I will argue that although altruism is a worthy ethical concept, it is by far not a binary term that could be linked to 'paid' (non-altruistic) and 'unpaid' (altruistic). Thereby, the first shift from simple to complex b&p ethics will become visible.

2.1. Why do people give b&p?

Before making normative statements, ethics must look at the evidence. In this case, it is necessary to recognize research from sociology and behavioral sciences regarding the question: Why do people give their blood or plasma?

A rather simple listing of factors that encourage or discourage people to give b&p, drawing from various surveys, can be seen in Table 1.

Very prominent in this list is the motivational factor of altruism. Its significance in the debate can be traced back to Richard Titmuss's 1970 book _The Gift Relationship_ [8]. Titmuss has found supporters [9–11] and critics [12,13]. His book undoubtedly has had its merits, especially in the 1970s, and his acknowledgment of altruism as a core value also for modern societies can be defended. However, Titmuss insists on a form of altruism that is too simplistic. Recent research in behavioral
science has demonstrated — against those who deny the existence of altruism as a human feature altogether [14,15] — that altruism indeed is a feature of human existence although only exceptionally in Tittmuss’s pure dyadic form (i.e., A helps B but B definitely does not help A) [16,17]. Instead, a more common pattern of altruism functions indirectly and thereby shows more complexity: Altruism in these cases is about role-modeling and reputation in social communities [18]. Hence, altruism indeed is one possible factor why people give b&b. It is a more complex, though, and has to acknowledge the social environment humans live in.

However, altruism is not the only explaining factor (cf. Table 1). We need a more complex theory of human behavior that integrates a wider range of factors influencing our decisions and actions. Such a theory can be found in Ick Ajzen’s “theory of planned behavior” [19] that has been used by G. Godin et al. to explain the intentions to give blood [20]. In this theoretical approach, our intentions are shaped by cognitive and affective attitudes (like calculating advantages against disadvantages or feeling anticipated regrets), by perceived social, moral, and descriptive norms, and by the perceived control over the situation we are in. All three factors are informed by individual and environmental causes that are present from childhood on. Whereas psychology can help people work on their attitudes and ethics can help them work on their perceptions of norms guiding their intentions, it should be possible and rather easy for the management of b&b collectors to help people potential donors maintaining control over the situation of giving b&b. This complex model makes it obvious that motivational factors like altruism are influenced and shaped by interrelated sources of psychological, social, and ethical origin. In the following section, I will focus on the ethical part of it.

2.2. Why should people give b&b?

Ethics concerns ‘the ought’ of our actions, in this case the question why people should give b&b (instead of merely asking why they actually do give b&b). This is not the place for giving a comprehensive introduction to ethics [21–23]. I will therefore only briefly point out the basic ideas and main arguments for each ethical theory, then concentrate on the practical implications for b&b donation, and close with a balanced critique.
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<p>| Table 2  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilitarianism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequentialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximizing the overall benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-utility rationale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.1. Utilitarianism: Ethics of incentives
- Practical implications of this utilitarian approach for b&ip collection may be:
  - Point out the positive consequences of giving b&ip.
  - Maximize the donor pool (considering age, risk factors, motivation).
  - Use incentive systems and reward the potential of the donation.

Proponents of utilitarianism appeal to people’s common sense: When the consequences are good, why shouldn’t I do it? It also fits the market context of the collecting and manufacturing industries. Utilitarian thinking helps securing a positive outcome by calculating returns on investments like a facilitating b&ip collection infrastructure, safety institutions, or incentive systems [24,25]. Moreover, utilitarian incentive systems do not necessarily require giving money to the donors; ‘incentives’ can have a variety of forms [1,26]. Finally, and maybe most important, incentives do not exclude altruism per se, only a specific form (i.e., pure altruism), which is not the ethically most relevant one. Hence, a donor can have a mixed motivation and give b&ip because she wants to help others and at the same time accept remuneration [25, 27].

Critics of utilitarianism, on the other hand, argue that good consequences (like getting desperately needed b&ip products) cannot justify any means as strict utilitarians may calculate. At least when it comes to violating basic human rights, there is a wide consensus that b&ip donations must be voluntary and that one must not sacrifice another person to get her blood or other tissue. However, critics of utilitarian thinking point out that this consensus can be corrupted earlier than when human rights violations become visible. In their eyes, it starts with the general tendency to commodify the human body [28]. This especially affects the weakest in society who cannot afford to say no to incentives [2,29,30]. Hence, their consent to give blood, plasma, or tissue is formally voluntary, though substantially corrupted. This leads to another well-known problem of utilitarian incentive systems for collecting b&ip: The weakest in society, who are attracted by incentives, may pose a safety issue [31–38]. Despite all efforts, a 100-percent safety can never be offered. So it comes to calculating how many risks we would accept in order to get the much needed b&ip. In this case we speak about risks for the potential recipients of b&ip products. In another case a similar risk calculation concerns the donor, namely, when it comes to determining the lower and upper age threshold of donors [39]. To be clear: calculating risks is an essential obligation in biomedicine and a necessary preliminary for ethical analyses.
Utilitarian would accept higher risks if thereby the positive outcome could also be maximized; their critics, however, would draw a line and say that whatever the outcome may be, certain risks cannot be justified. Another critical point regarding utilitarian incentive systems could be an accelerating tendency: Once b&l donation is assimilated to market mechanisms by offering financial incentives, one has to play according to market rules, i.e., offering more and more for the desired outcome. And finally, so the critics, this would lead to a disintegration of societal solidarity [8,11].

2.2.2. Deontology: Ethics of unconditional duties

Practical implications of this deontological approach for b&l collection may be:

- Make clear: Helping people who are in need of b&l products is a right reason for giving b&l. Hence, one has the moral duty to do so.
- The individual’s motivation to give b&l should be able to function as a general provision for all people.
- Never must b&l donors be treated as mere instruments to get the resources for therapies, but they must always be respected as persons with dignity.

Advocates of deontology appeal to people’s reason. In fact, it is hard to imagine someone who deliberately would portray him- or herself as an unreasonable person. We usually try to explain why we do something or why we omit something, and we try to use good arguments for this. Concerning b&l donation, it should be a rather easy case to argue why it is indeed reasonable to give blood or plasma (in fact, I did this in the section about consented starting points). By arguing that some duties are not only reasonable but categorical, i.e., unconditional, deontology furthermore provides the ethical basis for the notion of human rights – another point that will find wide support. If we accept human rights and their foundation in human dignity in general, we must also acknowledge them for b&l ethics. Hence, all exploitative arrangements that use donors as mere instruments for commercial or even therapeutic goals cannot be justified. Deontology thereby sharpens our awareness of direct and indirect exploitations. It ranks moral motives that are stimulated externally – be it by fear of negative consequences, be it by expectations of remunerations – as inferior. Incentives may manipulate people’s motives to donate and therefore are not ethical. Moreover, they cannot be generalized because I have to ask myself: If I only give blood or plasma when I get remunerated, could this become a general motive for all people? – Reason tells us that if everyone would follow such a rule this would lead to the collapse of the system because it cannot be financed.

Critics of deontology first argue that its reasonableness may be philosophically interesting but not practicable for a human’s life. It simply is a moral standard too high to demand that we only act ethically if we are not influenced by external motives like negative or positive expectations or by our feelings. Second, it can be questioned whether giving b&l really is a case for the categorical imperative. One could also argue that the donation is an example of a hypothetical imperative, i.e., a conditional obligation that depends on external factors (following the pattern ‘if . . . then . . .’).
The categorical notion of human dignity then would only be affected when it really comes to exploitative situations but not when merely incentives are offered, thereby leaving the potential donor the autonomy to give his or her donation the sense he or she wants it to have. Finally, one could critically ask why deontology’s categorical call of duty should apply to the moral decisions of (potential) donors only, whereas all the other parts in the b&p supply chain use a utilitarian cost-utility rationale. Or, with other words: Why should only the donor receive nothing?

2.2.3. Contractualism: Ethics of living with pluralism

Practical implications of this contractual approach for b&p collection may be:

- Acknowledge the pluralism in people’s motives to give b&p.
- You may use incentives but (a) do not sacrifice human rights for profits and (b) keep an eye on the least-advantaged when creating incentives in a donation system.
- Try to get as many people as possible on board of the system, integrating their individual ideologies.

Contractualism is the main ethical approach when it comes to finding a common framework for cooperation in pluralistic societies. By subscribing to the idea of political liberalism, one respects the various individual motives to give – or give not – b&p. Those who regard it as their categorical duty to give regardless of good or bad consequences are respected in the same way as those who think it proper to receive remuneration or need incentives [40]. Nevertheless, the liberal contract of society stipulates an unconditional minimum standard which is to be found in the basic human rights. Exploiting people therefore cannot be justified; an informed consent is always obligatory for giving b&p. Moreover, inequalities in societal institutions like b&p collection regimes must benefit those who are the least-advantaged in this setting. This is the fundamental principle of European social security systems and welfare states. Finally, from a theoretical perspective, contractualism explains the underlying ethical fabric of modern cooperative society: Self-interest and common-interest are not necessarily antagonists, and social exchanges like b&p donation are not zero-sum games. To cooperate by giving b&p is in one’s self-interest and it generates added value. Hence, we should provide as many people as possible with – real and ideological – opportunities to give their b&p [41].

Critics argue that the contractualism of political liberalism is a too pragmatic approach that neglects all the fundamental incompatibilities of people’s ideologies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic ideas</th>
<th>Core arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral autonomy</td>
<td>Humans are characterized by their morality, i.e. their ability to give their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>actions sense and motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable motives</td>
<td>An action is morally good if it is motivated by the right reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical duties</td>
<td>A reason is ethically justified if it passes the test of the categorical imperative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The salient point regarding b&p donation as, one has to play an active role in promoting the resources for dignity.
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Table 4
Contractualism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic ideas</th>
<th>Core arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluralistic society</td>
<td>People have different world views and ideologies. Nevertheless, we need a common framework for the basic structures of society for cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules for cooperation</td>
<td>Liberal societies are characterized by a continuous search for an ‘overlapping consensus’ of different world views concerning the rules of cooperation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accepting paid b&p donations may please those who, in a utilitarian theory, favor incentives. But it may at the same time cause others not to donate because they perceive the whole system as corrupted by accepting paid donations. Contractualism has no answer to those ‘fundamentalists’ except for negotiating and trying to convince them to cooperate with people whom they may regard as unethical. Another weakness of contractualism, it is said, is that it focuses more on the institutions (the rules of the game) than the people (the players). By that it acknowledges the complexity of human cooperation in pluralistic societies (and therefore is more complex than utilitarianism or deontology) but it falls short of taking those into consideration who must be motivated to cooperate for donating b&p. Cooperation through giving b&p is not self-sufficient, it needs a higher goal that is not addressed by contractualism. This question of a motivating higher goal is the starting point of the last ethical theory presented here.

2.2.4. Virtue ethics: Ethics about the good human life

Practical implications of this virtue ethics approach for b&p collection may be:

- Understand the act of giving b&p as part of a person’s identity.
- Acknowledge the excellence of donors.
- Provide people with role models.

Virtue ethics is quite different from the above mentioned approaches because it focuses rather on the question whether something is good or bad for human life than whether it is right or wrong compared to normative standards. Giving and receiving b&p is part of humans’ striving for a good life which they can only accomplish if they live together in a society that is characterized by exchanges in order to promote the common good. Giving b&p then indicates a good character because it acknowledges the shared common good of care in existential crises. By telling this to (potential) donors and by pointing out to role models (i.e., regular donors) one can appeal to people’s self-esteem. As donor-motivation research has shown, being a donor can become part of a person’s identity if one gives b&p regularly [42,43]. This goes along with virtue ethics’ argument that donating b&p can only be regarded as a virtue if it becomes habitual – especially when it is not so convenient to donate. Moreover, habitual acts are more likely to develop in a supportive social environment – a point that virtue ethics considers by embedding the individual in communities and society that have an influence on a person’s motivation. Hence, in contrast to the theories mentioned above, virtue ethics has the advantage of taking the psychological question
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic ideas</th>
<th>Core arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asking about the (ultimate) goal in life</td>
<td>Ethics is about finding ways to live a good life which motivates humans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledging that humans are societally embedded</td>
<td>Human life is about relationships within communities and society which, sharing a common good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on a person’s character</td>
<td>Character is a matter of integrating motives and means in relation to goals. Habitual acts can be virtues or vices in relation to the goal of a good human life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of motivation deeper into consideration. In this approach, one must offer (potential) donors more than incentives (although they may be part of it), one must offer them a sense for living a good life.

Critics of virtue ethics question whether this approach is feasible for modern pluralistic societies. First, they argue that the plurality of conceptions of a good life makes it impossible to presuppose that people would be motivated by a common goal. Second, they cite the old controversy between virtue ethics and situationalism – the latter arguing that human behavior is determined by the specific circumstances of a situation (e.g., being offered an incentive for giving b&p or not), not by people’s characters. Third, out of a liberal world view, they oppose one thing that is necessary for virtue theory: character formation. Whether one agrees with this opposition or not, it is clear that virtue ethics in b&p donation depends on outcomes in pedagogy and an awareness in society that goes beyond the b&p collection and manufacturing system.

2.2.5. Conclusions

The previous sections have illustrated that various ethical theories offer numerous answers to the question why people should give their blood or plasma. In essence, their answers are:

- Because it is useful (utilitarianism)
- Because it is a moral duty (deontology)
- Because it is part of society’s cooperation (contractualism)
- Because it tells of good character and excellence (virtue ethics)

Not all of the answers are compatible. This is most obvious when it comes to the debate of ‘paid vs. unpaid’ donation: Utilitarians would favor incentives if they produce a positive outcome whereas deontologists would criticize that such incentives could corrupt morality. Both are examples of rather simple approaches to b&p ethics.

In contrast, contractualism and virtue ethics widen the ethical perspective and thereby better acknowledge the given complexity. Contractualism embeds b&p donation into the social contract, virtue ethics into people’s common striving for a good life. Both would regard the ‘paid vs. unpaid’ debate as an important but not the only important question of b&p ethics. Whether a paid or an unpaid giving of b&p is ethically sound depends on the context, contractualism and virtue ethics would say.
3. Complex b&h ethics: The system

In the previous section I argued that a simple approach to b&h ethics tends to focus on the individual act of donating and the individual donor whereas a more complex approach takes the context more into consideration. This argument will now be finished by looking at the institutional level of the system: on the ethics of b&h collecting organizations and on the ethics of b&h collection regimes.

3.1. Ethics of b&h collecting organizations

Contextualizing the donor and his or her donation means that we have to talk about the ethics of a b&h collecting organization. The core message is: The organization’s ethos (i.e., the moral self-understanding) shapes the donation process, it frames the character of giving b&h. Two related issues shall be discussed here briefly: the role of organizational culture and the importance of an ethics of care.

3.1.1. Organizational culture

Culture is a complex phenomenon that no organization can escape. It is a conglomerate of artifacts (e.g., architecture, language, mission statements), espoused beliefs and values (e.g., strategies, goals, philosophies), and underlying assumptions (taken-for-granted beliefs, perceptions, and feelings) [44]. Everyone in an organization contributes to its culture but the culture is not only the sum of individuals; it has an institutional dimension, too. And it is a question of leadership to develop this culture [45]. Developing an organizational culture requires to find sense for the organization’s existence [46]. This sense is formulated by shared values of all stakeholders that shape the ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ factors of the enterprise [47].

For a b&h collecting organization this means:

- It must clarify the sense of its existence and formulate this. This can range from humanistic to for-profit missions. Whatever the sense is, it will function as a motivation for those who are working in the organization but also those who come into contact with it – donors and recipients of b&h.
- Organizational culture and public appearance must fit. This is an issue of credibility and trust – an asset that is of paramount importance for all healthcare organizations. If employees are treated with disrespect, it is unlikely that they will treat donors otherwise, despite all professionalism.
- The b&h collecting organization’s shared values that shape its culture have to be rooted in genuine b&h ethics (cf. sections above).

3.1.2. Ethics of care

Care or mindfulness is a state of mind and an attitude that stimulates behavior and actions. It is a quality asset of ‘high reliability organizations’ such as those working in the b&h industry [48]. Among the many features this type of organizations has, I want to single out the aspect of care for ongoing relationships.
It is a characteristic of a so-called ethics of care that it puts human relationships instead of individual persons into the center of ethical analysis [49]. Maintaining caring relationships is the goal. A caring organization therefore is mindful of all its stakeholders and ongoing relationships and tries to improve them. For b&p collecting organizations this especially concerns following relationships:

- Caring for the relationship between donors and collectors (as individual employees and as collecting organization)
- Caring for the relationship between donors and recipients of b&p products (notwithstanding the anonymity of the donation)

As mentioned above, caring also means taking action. It is not the place here to develop such action programs but it must be clear that being a mindful b&p collecting organization includes taking concrete steps to improve its core relationships. This not only makes sense from an ethical point of view as it is not the individual human resources that are the most important economic asset of healthcare organizations but their ability to create and maintain human relationships.

3.2. Ethics of b&p collection regimes

What has been said in regard to the organizational level can be transformed to the societal level: here, national or supranational b&p collection regimes shape the character or nature of giving b&p.

In a 2000 article [50] and in a 2006 book [51] Kieran Healy analyzed different collection regimes (state run, blood banks, and Red Cross). With this perspective, Healy shifted the attention from what I call simple to complex b&p ethics. It is not only the donors’ motives that influence the probability of giving b&p; it is the institutional setting, too — but not in a simple way:

"Collection regimes do not simply increase or decrease the donation rate along a sliding scale. They shape the kind of activity that blood donation is. [...] How you organize a blood supply system not only affects how much you collect and who you get it from, it shapes the character of donation." [50]

Basically, one can think of four future scenarios of collecting regimes:

- A purely market-driven regime, meaning that b&p is collected for a market-adequate price. This would make b&p products unaffordable.
- A solidarity-driven regime, meaning that the exchange of b&p is organized relatively directly, within face-to-face communities. This ignores the degree of differentiation and anonymity in modern societies.
- A purely gift-driven regime, meaning that only unpaid b&p donations would be accepted due to corruptive risks associated with incentives. This kind of "gift fetishism" [51] would widen the gap between the rhetoric of altruism on the collecting side and the reality of for-profit industry on the manufacturing and distribution side. As it has been shown in the ethical analysis, absolutizing the ‘paid vs. unpaid’ question also ignores more complex organizational and societal contexts.
A regime that uses (financial) incentives but retains the gift-like nature of the transaction. This approach requires a very careful handling of organizational and social ethics issues to keep the balance between a necessary supportive system for donation and corruption. Healy and other analysts favor such a mixed system [40,52–54].

3.3. Conclusions

Neither "gift fetishism" nor total commodification of the human body seem to be ethically sound ways of enabling people to live good lives. To find a balance between them, one has to acknowledge the complexity of b&b collection. Complex motivations of donors meet complex organizational values that operate in complex societal institutions. There are many factors in this setting that can be influenced. From an ethical perspective that builds on common starting points about the importance of b&b, it makes sense to argue for the utility of b&b donation, to place it within the social contract, to secure categorical safety precautions, and to take regular b&b donation as an example of a virtuous life. This perspective on the donor has to be met by a corresponding ethos of the collecting organization and the collection regime. Those engaged in b&b collection will be well advised to acknowledge the complex plurality of motives while simultaneously upholding the caring nature of b&b donation, collection, and distribution.

References

J. Wallner / Giving from the heart: Simple and complex blood and plasma ethics


[33] P.V. Holland, Selling blood vs. donating blood, Vox Sang. 94 (2008), 171.


