

I would say that the main ethical debate set by the narrated facts in the film is safety in biotechnology. Be it by drug production or diagnostical or therapeutical means of any kind. This also includes the previous steps of research and experimentation which plan to go forward in that therapeutical path.

As we all know, precisely in order to avoid any risk for the health in any of these steps, there is in all developed countries (and also in an international consensus level) an abundant regulation with controls which become stronger before the supply or direct use of the “product” (medicine or therapeutical process, diagnoses mean, etc.) in patients.

From the legal point of view, any lack of this kind of safety controls can bring – depending on if it has achieved effectively a clear risk for the health – responsibility at the administrative level or even (in most serious cases) at the criminal level.

In the case which is shown in the film, it is clear that the main character – moved by the desire of saving the cost of the authentic product and, so unauthorized – dispenses totally with any kind of security control– by hackring- of the process she uses directly with her grandfather; and she continues, in the same way, with no further test (of safety or that the product is in working order).

From the legal side, it would be, without any hesitation, a very imprudent behaviour, punishable for the result of the death of the old man, her grandfather.

In relation to the already mentioned, an interesting aspect which can rise from both points of view, ethical and legal, is the consent of the subjects over whom any experimentation takes place (for instance, in the last step of testing a new drug in humans). In general terms, from the traumatic Nazism experience and the indiscriminate experimentation with humans, numerous international treaties radically forbid any kind of experimentation which is not supported by the expressed and informed consent from whom is subjected to it. This is to prevent “using” the person in the opposite way of their dignity.

In our case, even in a “domestic” way, the main character acts without communicating at all to her grandfather he is using a hacked product, and thus, without letting him know the risks that it could bring. (At a legal level, there does exist a couple of interesting questions, even if this doesn’t seem to be the proper frame to deal with. For example, the problem of if a possible consent from the old man using a hacked product and, thus a potentially dangerous and risky one, would decrease or even remove the legal responsibility of the granddaughter).

Outside this, in another shot, the film also provokes some questions in relation with the tele-caring issue. I think the idea (or at least, as far as I’m concerned) that could be deduced is that this issue can be useful for some fixed things, but it cannot and must not substitute the individualized and human attentions (in the widest meaning of the term) to the patients. Even that, unluckily, the shortage of material means and humans seem to bring us in the opposite way (public health staff have less time to secure an individualized attention to their patients, and each time the public funds dedicated to social attendance in the strict way are more trifling – a very important sector of their

addressees is precisely the old people who live alone), there is no doubt that an important part of the treatment of any patient (with which the professional should be careful) is the psychological and human factor and the proper communication with the patient; to make him/her understand what is happening, to enable them to talk about how they are doing, to make them feel accompanied, etc. Even if this isn't the main topic of the film, it really dislodges a clear loneliness feeling by the old man, and the totally impersonalized behavior of the telecaring mechanism which reminds to him to take his pills is overlying the necessity of a (at least, minimal) human and individualized attention.