

Ngendananimana Arthur

Professor Bomberger

English 273: Literature and the Healing Arts

8 NOV.2024

A Difficult Decision Making

Doctors face difficult decisions every day, especially in the medical field. Within the medical field, some moments cause doctors to prioritize the best interests of their patients; while following the guidelines of medical requirements and at the same time not ignoring their ethical values. The narrator's decision not to amputate the patient's hand immediately was the right choice. It demonstrates the dedication to helping each patient, regardless of their beliefs and background. As a doctor, she must heal, not judge. Amputating the hand right away would have compromised the doctor's integrity and gone against her beliefs and teachings. She stays true to what doctors are taught and that is to do what's best for their patients regardless of their background or the possibilities of what they might have done.

The first reason I believe the doctor made the right decision not to amputate immediately is that it aligned with her beliefs and training. She was taught to heal patients regardless of their backgrounds. She states, "These possibilities make no difference to me. I intend to make something beautiful from the mess spilled in front of me" (Eisenhuth). This shows her focus on helping rather than judging. She could have easily judged the patient, perhaps he was the bomber or he was trying to diffuse a bomb. If she had ignored her moral compass and decided to go against the medical guidelines, she would have decided to amputate the patient arm just because it seemed to be the easiest option available or simply

because she did not believe he was a good person. When she discusses making something beautiful, I think she is referring to her healing abilities, which is taking something broken and restoring life; transforming the brokenness into something more delightful. What could possibly be more beautiful than life itself, in a way that shows how much she enjoys doing her job?

Secondly, Another reason I believe she made the right choice is that amputating the hand would have gone against her training and the Hippocratic Oath, which requires doctors to act in their patients' best interests. According to a Canadian case study by Christiane Rochon and Bryn Williams-Jones, "Most medical codes of ethics are based on the Hippocratic Oath and state that physicians have a primary obligation to act in and protect their patients' best interests." She was taught to prioritize her patients' well being, so cutting off the hand would have conflicted with her values and education. When she thinks, "I can do this, it's the right thing to do," she's in a way referencing her own oath and the belief that a patient's well being comes first. This shows that her duty isn't just about treating injuries, she's dedicated to saving her patient's hand for his future. Trying to save the patient's hand, even in tough situations, demonstrates her belief that a doctor's job is to achieve the best possible outcome for each patient, no matter how challenging the outcome might seem. When she declares, "We're not amputating, we're reattaching," (Eisenhuth) it shocks the other surgeons and highlights her strong sense of responsibility. Even though amputating would have been the easier option, as the others suggested, she chose to try to save his hand knowing it would have a big impact on his future, showing her commitment to doing what's right for her patient and staying true to her ethical beliefs.

The narrator's decision to resist the pressure to amputate shows the struggle between doing what is easy and doing what feels right. "She points at my surgical field. "No one needs a hand to live." Despite the pressure to amputate, the narrator insisted on saving and reattaching the hand. Even though amputating would have been the easier and more accepted choice, she chose to reattach because she believed it was the right thing to do. According to a case study by Christiane Rochon and Bryn Williams-Jones, "the codes of ethics serve as a guide but are not tailored for all complex clinical situations, especially those with dual obligations." She could have followed the military's suggestion to amputate, but she decided against it, showing that she acted based on her moral beliefs even when others disagreed. This decision shows her dedication to her ethical beliefs and her commitment to doing what she feels is best for her patient.

In Conclusion, The narrator's decision not to amputate the patient's hand immediately was the right choice. If she had chosen to amputate right away, it would have gone against her morals and duties as a doctor and going against the guidelines of the medical field concerning what she has acquired and learned as a doctor. This indicates that she is committed to healing and providing the best possible outcome for her patients, even when there are easier solutions or when the patient might not have been deemed deserving. The doctor's focus and dedication on the pathway of helping and saving lives; Deciding to not compromise her beliefs as an individual and staying within the guidelines and rules of the medical field, and still choosing to do right by her patient, it indicates that she truly value her position and her belief of taking something broken and making it beautiful once again.. As a doctor she truly understood that

there are moments that require difficult decisions to be made, but those should always be made in the best interests of her patient.

Worlds cited page

Eisenhuth, Kati. What Is Buried Beneath

A Canadian Case Study. *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, vol. 44, no. 4, Winter 2016.