

Doctor, talk to me

Literature



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The writer of the article, Doctor, Talk to Me, searches for a doctor that has certain qualities that he thinks are the qualities of the best doctor. For example, he prefers one that is a Jew and that holds certain mannerisms. He has a preformed opinion of an ideal doctor with the capacity to handle his situation. This is not a common practice in medicine because what matters is the ability of the doctor to address a condition effectively and not the attributes of the doctor.

The main argument in this essay relates to perceptions towards doctors and the way doctors perceive their patients. The writer is biased on the doctor that treats them; he has a particular taste of a doctor based on historical perspective such as the ability to treat his father. In addition, the beliefs that have been passed across to the writer make him to view doctors in manner that doctors have to meet specified criteria. He also perceives that doctors ought to portray certain mannerisms when handling patients. However, he also addresses the issue of the doctor perceiving the patient as a dignified individual. That is why the essay is ultimately titled ‘ Doctor, Talk to Me’, meaning that the patient needs to hear the verdict of the doctor as they interact. This does not mean that the patient is begging for love and compassion from the doctor.

The author describes the doctor of his choice to be a ‘ potent doctor’. This ideal doctor according to his preference ought to be a Jew, the doctor ought to be well and neatly dressed, should have an outstanding office, should look determined and should have speaking mannerisms. Generally, an ideal doctor should be at a position of treating both the body and the soul. This ideal doctor should serve as a poet, a scholar, a priest, and a philosopher for his patient.

The author mentions that he wants a doctor that 'owns his illness'. This means that he needs a doctor that is a specialist in that particular illness. In addition, he prefers a doctor that is capable of customizing the treatment to that particular case and not in any way generalizing the illness. He does not want the doctor to love him. This is because the doctor would consider himself being in the shoes of the patient hence bringing forth sympathy instead of treatment. He argues that if the doctor has to love him, he is obliged to give something back to the doctor such as being interesting. The writer argues about changes in medical practice that facilitates the social environment between the patient and the doctor. His proposition is that the environment should encourage both the patient and the doctor to interact freely; the doctor being cognizant of the fact that the patient is an important party and the patient being friendly and interesting to the doctor. The changes that the author proposes are largely reasonable. It is important that the environment between the doctor and the patient should not have a very wide gap that discourages the parties from having no appeal to the other. The patient and the doctor should socialize comfortably and freely.