***Part 1: Chart***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Autonomy** | Mike and Joanne were given the free will to make a decision with regards to the treatment of their son. When they decided to for-go the dialysis and place their faith on God, the doctors did not push them but gave them an opportunity of accepting them if James was not healed in a week. Mike and Joanne also understood their rights as James’s parents and decided to do what they thought was best for their son. However, the conflict between their Christian faith and healing and modern treatment played a major role in confusion had at the end of the case study. |
| **Beneficence** | When it was apparent that James was in desperate need of a kidney transplant, Mike and Joanne offered to be the donors. Unfortunately, tests to ascertain tissue match showed they were not compatible. However, it is evident they wanted to do good by offering to donate a kidney for their child. Had they been compatible, they would have saved their son without the involvement of family and friends. |
| **Non-maleficence** | When all the people who offered to donate a kidney failed the tissue test match, it was evident that James’ identical twin Samuel was the only compatible donor. However, Mike was apprehensive at the thought of putting the life of his other child at risk by making him a donor. If Samuel became a compatible donor, Mike would have another son lose a kidney an issue that had the potential of other future health issues. Mike felt like he would do his other son harm by allowing him to be a donor. |
| **Justice** | The issue affected friends and family of Mike and Joanne who offered to take tests to ascertain if they were compatible donors. The social responsibility evidenced by the offer to be donors is part of the social justice of principalism. |

***Part 2: Evaluation***

A keen analysis of Christianity indicates that people are given an opportunity of free will. The religion is based on the fact that people have the chance of whether or not to live according to its principals. In this way, people are offered an opportunity to become a Christian or not. It is this same flexibility that is evident in principalism wherein autonomy people have the chance to depend on their faith for healing, depend on medicine for treatment or combine both (Carlin, 2019). In the process, Christianity supports autonomy and gives people the flexibility of making decisions that are relevant to their situation.

The basis of Christianity is to give people an opportunity without coercion. Irrespective of having promises such as eternal life, people are allowed to decide to avoid it in totality. Notably, with regards to beneficence as an aspect of principalism, the general applicability is to assert on the part of doing good (Ortmann et al. 2016). Through beneficence, Christianity as people are geared towards doing to others what they would like done to them. In the end, the world winds up with individuals who are interested in good deeds.

Christianity as a religion especially the teachings of the New Testament are primarily on morals and ethics. The Ten Commandments further assert the importance of people remaining faithful to the religion, God and others. Therefore, Christianity allows for non-maleficence to be an integral part of the decision-making process (Carlin 2019). Focusing on the aspect of morals and ethics, societies and individuals expect people to behave morally especially with regards to contentious issues that have direct impacts on the people. Unfortunately, the law does not protect people from immoral and unethical behaviors, and thus the world relies on personal principals to guide people into being moral.

Through principalism, Christianity tests the faith of the Christians in addition to the efficiency of their decision-making processes. Ortmann et al. (2016) argue that testing the faith of the people is meant to increase its strength and to have a better understanding of the workings of God. Through the concept of principalism people focus on their faith in relation to a practical decision. Good Christians weigh the option of relying on their faith while better Christians seek a way of harnessing the two concepts for better results. The issue is mainly applicable in the health care industry where the point of faith is highly tested.

Fortunately, religion allows for the combination of the two concepts, especially in the health care industry. For instance, an individual can believe their kin will be healed after the application of medicine. In the process, of waiting for the treatment to take effect, Christians have to understand that God will treat the person. However, some people have a strong faith and believe their faith can improve them. Such cases have provided contentious issues and increased the scrutiny placed on people’s religious beliefs. Fortunately, the point is still in discussion and investigation creating room for the application of Christian policies. More so, Christianity supports principalism in the sense that people will not be judged irrespective of the decision they decide to take.
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