How Hospitals Have Become Obsolete

Posted on September 13, 2019

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/how-hospitals-have-become-obsolete/

Introduction

The argument that hospitals are becoming obsolete identifies a genuine transformation but overstates its conclusion. Many services that once required an inpatient bed now occur in outpatient clinics, ambulatory surgery centers, physicians' offices, community facilities, or patients' homes. Digital monitoring and telehealth can further separate care from the hospital building. Yet hospitals remain essential for emergency treatment, intensive care, complex surgery, childbirth complications, trauma, disaster response, and patients requiring continuous multidisciplinary support. The more accurate claim is that the hospital is being redefined. Its future role will be narrower in some areas, more technologically intensive in others, and increasingly connected to a distributed network of care (Emanuel, 2018).

Why Hospitals Became Central

Hospitals were not always the preferred place for treatment. In earlier periods, many people received care at home, while charitable hospitals often served those without family resources. Anesthesia, antisepsis, sterile surgery, laboratory medicine, diagnostic imaging, blood transfusion, antibiotics, and professional nursing gradually made institutional care safer and more effective. Hospitals concentrated expensive equipment and specialized knowledge that could not be reproduced in every household. Public investment, insurance reimbursement, medical education, and philanthropy then expanded their reach. This history matters because the modern hospital did not become dominant through architecture alone. It became dominant because certain forms of diagnosis, treatment, observation, and emergency response benefited from concentrated resources and coordinated teams (Emanuel, 2018).

The Shift toward Outpatient Care

Medical progress has shortened recovery and moved many procedures outside inpatient wards. Minimally invasive surgery, improved anesthesia, better pain control, rapid diagnostics, and standardized pathways allow selected patients to return home on the same day. Cancer treatment, dialysis, rehabilitation, imaging, and chronic-disease management frequently occur without admission. This shift can reduce costs and hospital-acquired complications while allowing patients to

recover in familiar surroundings. It does not prove that hospitals are unnecessary. Outpatient services often depend on hospital laboratories, specialists, emergency backup, and referral systems. The relevant policy question is which patients can be treated safely in lower-intensity settings and how continuity will be maintained when responsibility crosses several organizations (Emanuel, 2018).

Hospital Care at Home

Hospital-at-home programs provide selected patients with inpatient-level services in their residences through in-person visits, remote monitoring, medication delivery, diagnostics, and rapid escalation protocols. The United States Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services launched the Acute Hospital Care at Home initiative during the pandemic, and Congress extended its flexibilities through September 30, 2030. This development confirms that the location of acute care can change. It also demonstrates that home care is not simply discharge with a video call. Successful programs require reliable caregivers or support plans, safe housing, broadband or communication access, transportation, pharmacy coordination, and the ability to return a patient quickly to a facility when conditions worsen (Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, 2024, 2026).

Care That Still Requires a Hospital

Some services remain difficult or unsafe to decentralize. Major trauma, stroke intervention, organ transplantation, neonatal intensive care, severe sepsis, complex cardiac procedures, and rapidly changing multisystem illness require immediate access to specialists, blood products, operating rooms, imaging, laboratories, and continuous monitoring. A patient may deteriorate before a mobile team can arrive, and home environments cannot reproduce every infection-control or resuscitation resource. Hospitals also care for patients whose diagnoses are uncertain and whose needs change hour by hour. The continued existence of these cases means that hospital obsolescence is unlikely. The challenge is to reserve high-cost facilities for work that genuinely benefits from concentration while avoiding admissions that add risk without proportional value (American Hospital Association, n.d.).

Emergency and Disaster Capacity

Hospitals provide social infrastructure that becomes most visible during crises. Emergency departments receive people regardless of appointment, and trauma centers organize regional response to accidents and violence. During epidemics, heat emergencies, storms, and mass-casualty events, hospitals coordinate critical care, isolation, diagnostics, and public-health communication. Excess capacity can appear inefficient during ordinary periods but become essential when demand suddenly rises. A purely market-based system may underinvest in readiness because unused beds, backup generators, stockpiles, and training do not produce immediate revenue. Reform should

therefore distinguish waste from resilience. Communities need enough distributed capacity to manage routine care and enough hospital capability to absorb unpredictable events without collapse (American Hospital Association, n.d.).

Hospital-Acquired Harm

Critics correctly note that hospitalization can cause harm. Patients may acquire infections, experience medication errors, lose mobility, become delirious, or undergo unnecessary testing. Sleep disruption and separation from family can worsen recovery, especially for older adults. These risks strengthen the case for avoiding preventable admissions and shortening stays when clinically appropriate. They do not justify abandoning hospitals. They justify safer design, infection prevention, adequate staffing, medication reconciliation, mobility programs, quieter environments, and transparent quality measurement. Moving care home can introduce different risks, including caregiver burden, missed deterioration, fragmented communication, and unequal access. The comparison should be between complete care models rather than between an idealized home and a poorly managed ward (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, n.d.).

Rural and Safety-Net Hospitals

The claim that hospitals should shrink can have very different consequences in wealthy cities and rural or underserved communities. A metropolitan region may contain several facilities and specialized outpatient alternatives, while a rural hospital may be the only source of emergency stabilization, maternity care, diagnostics, and local employment across a large area. Financial closure can force patients to travel hours for time-sensitive care. Safety-net hospitals also treat uninsured and medically complex populations whose needs are not easily transferred to profitable ambulatory centers. Reform should support appropriate regionalization and telehealth while preserving essential access. Efficiency cannot be measured only through occupancy or procedure volume when geographic availability itself protects health and survival (Health Resources and Services Administration, n.d.).

Consolidation and Market Power

Hospitals often respond to declining inpatient demand and payment pressure by merging into larger systems, purchasing physician practices, and expanding outpatient networks. Integration can improve coordination and purchasing power, but it can also reduce competition and increase prices. A service performed in a hospital-owned facility may receive higher reimbursement than the same service in an independent office, encouraging consolidation without necessarily improving outcomes. Antitrust enforcement and site-neutral payment debates therefore matter to the future of hospitals. Policymakers should reward quality, access, and coordination rather than ownership status alone. A

smaller number of powerful systems is not equivalent to a more efficient network, especially when patients and insurers have little negotiating choice.

Technology and Remote Monitoring

Wearable sensors, connected devices, artificial intelligence, and telehealth can identify deterioration, support medication adherence, and reduce unnecessary travel. Technology is particularly valuable when it extends scarce expertise into rural homes or allows follow-up after discharge. However, remote data can generate false alarms, miss context, or create overwhelming workloads. Algorithms may perform differently across populations, and patients may lack devices, connectivity, privacy, or confidence using the system. Digital care also changes responsibility: someone must review alerts, contact the patient, and decide when escalation is required. Technology can redistribute hospital functions, but it does not eliminate clinical judgment, physical examination, human support, or the need for facilities capable of responding when remote care reaches its limit.

The Hospital Workforce

Hospitals depend on nurses, physicians, pharmacists, therapists, technicians, cleaners, food-service workers, administrators, and many other professionals. Shifting care outward changes where these workers operate rather than automatically reducing the need for them. Home-based acute care may require travel, remote command centers, flexible scheduling, and stronger coordination with community services. Workforce planning must address burnout, staffing ratios, training, occupational safety, and fair compensation. A future hospital that keeps only the sickest patients may actually require more skilled labor per occupied bed. Policymakers should not assume that fewer admissions produce simple savings if remaining cases are more complex and if community teams need investment to manage care safely beyond the facility.

Patient Preference and Equity

Many patients prefer home because it offers comfort, family presence, and control. Others live alone, lack stable housing, face domestic danger, or do not want relatives to become unpaid caregivers. Some homes cannot accommodate equipment or infection precautions. Choice should therefore be genuine rather than driven by insurers seeking lower costs. Patients need understandable information about benefits, responsibilities, emergency arrangements, and alternatives. Equity review is essential because affluent households may gain convenient home services while poorer patients remain in underfunded institutions or receive unsafe substitutions. The objective is not to move care out of hospitals at any price. It is to provide the least restrictive setting capable of delivering reliable, respectful, and clinically appropriate care (Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, 2024).

A Network Rather than a Building

The future health system should be organized as a network connecting primary care, prevention, mental health, pharmacies, diagnostics, rehabilitation, home services, emergency transport, and hospitals. The hospital becomes one node with distinctive high-intensity capabilities rather than the default center for every medical need. Payment and records must follow the patient across settings, and responsibility should not disappear during handoffs. Shared care plans, interoperable data, rapid consultation, and clear escalation criteria are necessary. This network model also requires investment in public health and social supports because avoidable admissions often arise from unstable housing, food insecurity, inadequate chronic-disease management, or lack of timely outpatient access rather than from a need for hospital technology (Emanuel, 2018).

Evaluating the Obsolescence Argument

The obsolescence argument is valuable when it challenges institutions to stop treating inpatient volume as the main measure of success. Hospitals should not preserve beds or procedures merely because existing payment systems reward them. The argument becomes misleading when it implies that technological substitution will remove the need for concentrated acute care or solve access problems automatically. Hospitals are changing in function, duration of stay, and relationship with other settings. Some buildings may close or become smaller, while others will specialize and coordinate care across wider regions. The correct standard is not whether a service occurs inside a hospital. It is whether the system delivers safe outcomes, reasonable cost, equitable access, continuity, and preparedness (Emanuel, 2018).

Conclusion

Hospitals have not become obsolete, but the model in which most diagnosis and treatment flows through an inpatient institution is declining. Outpatient procedures, telehealth, and hospital-at-home programs can improve convenience and reduce unnecessary exposure to institutional harm. Hospitals nevertheless remain indispensable for emergencies, complex procedures, intensive monitoring, uncertain diagnoses, and community resilience. Their future should involve fewer avoidable admissions, stronger safety practices, transparent competition, and deeper integration with home and community care. The hospital will survive not because every traditional service must remain within its walls, but because certain forms of coordinated, high-intensity care cannot be replaced safely. Transformation, rather than disappearance, is the defensible conclusion (American Hospital Association, n.d.; Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, 2024, 2026; Emanuel, 2018).

References

1. Emanuel, Ezekiel J. “Are Hospitals Becoming Obsolete?” *The New York Times*, 27 Feb. 2018.
2. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. “Acute Hospital Care at Home Data Release Fact Sheet.” 2026.
3. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. *Report on the Study of the Acute Hospital Care at Home Initiative*. 2024.
4. American Hospital Association. “Hospitals and Health Systems Are Essential to Their Communities.”
5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. “Healthcare-Associated Infections.” CDC Patient Safety Resources.
6. Health Resources and Services Administration. Rural Hospital and Health-Care Access Resources.

Copyright © 2026 Academic Master.