**Case Study: Healing and Autonomy**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Medical Indications**Beneficence and Nonmaleficence | **Patient Preference**Autonomy |
| The medical indication is proof and explanation about the patient's physical and mental condition that gives out the diagnostic and therapeutic activities on prevention and cure of illness. In the case study, the nephrologists practice beneficence by indicating the importance of dialysis to avoid kidney failure. In contrast, James' parents thought that they are doing no harm to the health of James but practice nonmaleficence by taking James back to the hospital to minimize the damage. | In the case study, James, who suffered from kidney failure, does not make decisions on the medication because he is only eight years old. On the other side, Mike practices autonomy, where he decides to skip dialysis as preferred by the nephrologist. Mike and Joanne decided to take James to a faith healing service. Importantly, patients ought to be involved in decision making rather than problem-solving. |
| **Quality of Life**Beneficence, Nonmaleficence, Autonomy | **Contextual Features**Justice and Fairness |
| Life’s quality expresses a value of judgment where the aspects of living a healthy life are considered to be good or bad better or worse. In beneficence, the doctors perform their level best to make sure the parents and James are satisfied and improve the quality of life of James. In maleficence, not allowing Samuel to donate a kidney is good since, after the donation, the boys will be at risk since each one will have one kidney. Finally, in autonomy, Samuel's quality of life depends on the decision that his parents will make, and that's why Mike finds it very difficult to allow kidney transplants.  | Contextual consideration influences medical decisions. Family and friends bound the relationship between the patient and the doctor. In the case study, family context plays a pivotal role in making a huge decision on James's health. Justice is not served to James, whereby his parents find it hard to accept kidney donation from Samuel. Mike and Joanne are not ready to risk by having both of them with a single kidney.  |

**Part 1: Chart**

**Christian Worldview, On How the “Healing and Autonomy” Principles Should Be *Specified,* And *Weighted* in the Case Study.**

Autonomy, in the book of Genesis, when God created man, God gave man free will to choose right from wrong. A Christian physician in medical practices must inform the patient and decide to respect the will of the patient. In the case above, James's nephrologist gave mike and Joanne a free will to choose whether to carry on to dialysis or to seek spiritual intervention. Despite that, the case required urgent dialysis; still, James's nephrologist allowed them to make their choices.

 Non-maleficence, this principle gives the care provider a moral obligation to no cause harm to others and to act for the benefit of others. A Christian physician in his medical practices should also know that he is working for the good of the patient. It is in Christian ethics for a medical practitioner to do treatment, not because of the pay but to save a life in the case study above. James's nephrologist advised mike and Joanne for dialysis even If they had refused earlier.

Beneficence is a law that relates how human relationships with a fellow human. As a caregiver, we seek to do for the benefit of others. In the case above, Mike, Joanne, and Samuel were ready to donate a kidney to James, and it is that they were not compatible. James's nephrologist worked hard to find the compatible kidney for James.in that case, they worked for James' benefit.

Justice principles require patients to be treated alike without discrimination. James's nephrologist was fair in his work.

**Christian Way on How to Balance Principles of Healing and Autonomy**

Autonomy; because the respect for free will is in the scripture and the interaction between man and God .as in Genesis when God created man he chose to respect his will even though he had the idea of the consequences.it is the duty of a Christian physician to explain to the patient regarding his health position and possible outcomes, but the physician should not interfere with the choices of the patient

Non-maleficence: In the gospel of Luke, God gave his only son Jesus to suffer for the benefit of man. Jesus was crucified and died to save the world. A Christian physician has to work for the benefit of the patient and not for money. The Christian physician must treat and God to heal the patient.

Beneficence: the bible commands us to love our neighbors as we love our self. The law of beneficence relates to how humans should treat fellow humans. As a caregiver, the benefit to others should become our motivating power. As Christian, all our choices should be based not on the selfish gain but should be motivated by the benefit of others.

Justice: this principle guides us on treating others regardless of their faults, gender, race, and many others fairly. Each patient deserves treatment with the same level of care, dignity, and compassion regardless of their religion or race. As a Christian, ethically we should seek justice for those who have not.
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