**Can doctors say 'enough'?**

Introduction

The field of medicine and medical practices is a crucial one for it is involved with matters that directly affect life, i.e., the well being of human beings. The practitioners in the field however sometimes find themselves in a position in which they have to do that which may be perceived unconventional by the majority of the people who do not understand the various aspects of the outcomes involved. In order to minimize the controversies associated by the actions taken by the practitioners in the field, the various bodies governing their activities have come up with clearly stated principles and policies that should be embraced in such situations. However, that notwithstanding, controversies still exist as those handled below (Curtis, 2010, 37).

This case indeed represents one of the most controversial situations a medical practitioner might find himself or herself in. The writer has in many aspects argued from the professional logic in the medicine field citing the various norms and principles as outlined in the various laid down structures of the field. The writer introduces the article from a neutral perspective as he endeavors to let the reader see both sides of the matter and goes further to create an argument that inspires one to start thinking critically about the case. The writer’s line of thinking is one in which there is the consideration of what is the right thing to be done and does not attempt to answer the question of whether or not what actually happened was justified. Instead, the writer leaves that ruling at the readers’ discretion (Gedge, 2007, 217).

The writer presents the core principles of the medical profession by which most crucial decisions should be based. He clearly describes the situations in which the core principles of the medical have to be applied, but he also indicates the situations in which they are limited or can be applied in a different manner. The writer, for example, outlines how the balance between the two core principles, beneficence and non-maleficence leads to the creation of controversial situations in medical practice. These situations generate different interpretations especially in cases in which two different parties involved in the case take the two different principles as a basis for argument. The general philosophy in the field is for the best to be delivered by the medical practitioners and the expectations of the patient to be met accordingly. However, when an act of helping is interpreted as an act of destroying by the other party, it becomes hard to make a decision that lacks controversy. The writer has exhausted all the potential viewpoints that would be taken by the involved parties, and the reader is challenged to be the ultimate decision-maker in the case after having analyzed the stated evidence from both professional and logical perspectives (Pattison, 2004, 137).

Conclusion

The case together with the associated worldwide controversy is a clear indication that the principles governing the medical field are not yet substantial to ensure satisfaction of parties involved. This therefore calls for a clear restatement of the principles to cover such situations. In case of difficulty in implementing such, then it will be more advantageous for the caretakers of the patients to be contacted before such a stage is reached so as consensus is reached on what action should be taken (Gleeson, 2007, 61).
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