

Ethical consideration project

[Sociology](#), [Ethics](#)



The healthcare delivery system is constantly changing it will continue to impact the kinds of services that are provided by religiously affiliated institutions. The pursuit of increased health care coverage and access at decreased cost will undoubtedly result in market and legal pressure on Catholic sponsored hospitals that provide health care, because it would contravene their ethical, moral, and religious principles. Currently, the law does not compel religious institutions to provide care that does not comport with their beliefs this is a means that has to stop especially concerning the well-being of the patient.

This continual evolution of ethical, moral, and religious health care delivery, however, threatens to diminish, if not completely shut down the ability of these sectarian hospitals to maintain control over the kinds of medical care that they provide. Specifically, in this era pervasive federal and state regulations of health care delivery will put pressure on religious providers to give care even if it is against their philosophical foundation or they will risk the chance of going out of business because of the lack of government funding like Medicare and Medicaid.

The states pursuit of reform and the provisional requirement of health care services are now increasing even more, hospitals are now more reliant on government funding so there is a tension between Catholic hospital and government to give patients the proper care that is needed which is not based on moral beliefs. Because Catholic hospitals frequently cite religious, and moral beliefs as the bases for rejecting patient demands for abortion, and in this case the morning after pill as discussed in the Brownfield case this

looming conflict between religious freedom and patient access for care will continue to grow.

This growing conflict has brought difficulty to the legal, social, and to the policy makers who must attempt to resolve this issue. In the Brownfield case the morning-after pill prevents fertilization or inhibits implantation of the fertilized egg. A rape victim should have the necessary treatment available or get referred to another hospital and in an event that they are not given the proper treatment they should have a viable claim for medical malpractice. I agree with the decision that was made by the judge and here is my reasoning.

If the morning after pill is given to a rape victim it stops the attachment of a fetus which was conceived under a vicious crime which would not be considered an abortion since the morning after pill has prevented the attachment. I think that it is a patient's right to control their own health care and that this should prevail over any hospitals moral and religious convictions, because we as patients need to know what is available and the best treatment out there to insure our well-being.