

# Medical ethics assignment

[Art & Culture](#)



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

This week we watched a video about a man named Paul who holds strong Christian morals and whom wished to enter into the medical field. Two scenarios were involved. Scenario 1 discussed Paul as he was applying to medical schools. When he went to interview at these schools and was asked his stance on abortion, he responded truthfully saying he was anti-abortion based on his religious beliefs, and was denied entrance into the school. Scenario 2 showed Paul post medical degree seeking work.

He interviewed at a small family practice clinic where the majority of the physicians were pro-abortion. He declined the job offer. Even though the clinic did not mind his stance on abortion, he did not want to be the minority in his stance. Believe that in the first scenario, the school was wrong for not accepting him based on his personal, religious belief, and in scenario 2, I believe the family practice clinic was right in accepting him, but it was Paul who ultimately made the decision not to work there, due to his minority view.

In scenario 1, the medical schools wrongly discriminated against Paul due to his religious belief. According to the U. S. Department of Education, under federal law, schools that receive funding from the government are prohibited from denying applicants based on religious belief ([https:// www. Deed. Gob, 2004](https://www.Deed.Gob, 2004)). In an article from the National Catholic Register, the article explains “while the law prohibits explicit discrimination against pro-life candidates, it does not prohibit schools from inquiring about abortion during the interviewing process. Unfortunately, this situation creates a loophole big enough to drive a truck through” (Subtler, 2011). One could easily argue in the school’s defense: that by eying Paul and other pro-life applicants

admission to medical schools, this would lead to less future close-mindedness in the medical field. Ultimately, I disagree with denying an individual access to education due to personal beliefs, even if it promotes a favorable outcome. The schools are exhibiting an objectivism ethical stance where their view is not motivated by religion, but by knowledge and judgment (Webb, 1 OFF judgment of pro-life applicants).

They believe that by accepting such applicants, they are, in the long run, possibly causing harm to female patients by denying them access to abortions. Whereas Paul exhibits deontological ethics: Paul, the ethical person, follows an identified set of principals; in this case, Christian religion values. He abides by these duties, which he views as something that he ultimately must follow above all else (Merrill, 1996). In scenario 2, Paul is looking to join a family health clinic where the majority of the physicians are pro-choice.

Paul declines this job offer since he does not want to be within the minority belief. The clinic was willing to hire Paul, regardless of religious belief, but Paul declines the offer. In the second scenario, I believe Paul's individual right to personal belief is upheld, unlike when he applied to medical school. This job was willing to hire Paul, but told him that his peers held the alternative view stance. The practice displayed its willingness to hire based on equal opportunity terms, but it is ultimately Paul's religious beliefs and personal ethics that lead him to reject the position.

Analyzers of this scenario might claim that Paul should have worked there regardless of his beliefs. Obviously, the practice was willing to exhibit

tolerance by hiring someone whose views were so efferent from the majority of the workers. The workplace is a place where workers should be allowed to exercise the belief in which they agree with, whether it be motivated by objectivism or demonology. At the same time while people should be entitled to freedom of religion, there is also the matter of not imposing ones viewpoints on others.

From the information provided, the practice seemed more than willing to tolerate Pall's beliefs, even though Paul was ultimately not willing to do the same in return. Pall's beliefs have not only affected his profession and education, UT also his ability as a doctor. The Hippocratic Oath, a rite of passage by members of the medical profession, is ultimately a promise to do no harm (Antonio, Antonio, Grandest, Ambassador, Seasonings, & Antonio, 2010, p. 3075-9).

However, Pall's promise to do no harm impedes on the harm that can possibly be caused by the denial of abortions to women. If a woman requires an abortion due to rape or medical necessity and Paul denies the opportunity (by following his beliefs), in effect, this decision harms the woman involved - both mentally and physically. Pall's levels have undoubtedly altered the course of his life. Pall's religion has played an integral role in selecting both a medical school and Job opportunity.

By upholding strong Christian morals, Paul has been denied access to certain medical schools based on his view of abortion. Pall's decision on Jobs has also been affected. He had to search elsewhere due to the clinic he was interviewing for had opposite beliefs than he maintains. While in the first

scenario, Paul had merit for being discriminated against based on religion, I believe the second situation was based on Pall's feelings of being a minority and it was his personal decision not to work for that clinic.