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**Charlie Gard Case**

1. **When A Person’s Individual Choices Are In Direct Conflict With His/Her Society, What Are The Consequences? How Was This Demonstrated In The Charlie Gard Case?**

Individuals have choices that may cause conflicts with society. Society would never agree. Therefore we shouldn't worry about it. It's enough if your loved ones accept your choices. But this battle may result in death or severe losses. In the case of Charlie Gord, the child's mother appealed the High Court's decision to let him die, arguing that it was not in his best interests to live. His mother couldn't do anything since the hospital had to let his kid die, but she hoped a particular doctor might assist (Lantos, 2017). Legally, the matter was simple. If the patient can decide, someone close to them can act in their best interest. When the terms "best interests" are used, additional factors such as patient values and beliefs should be represented. Charlie's interest has been ignored since very young children lack convictions and values that medical claims should recognize.

Furthermore, since the use of the ventilator was burdensome, the doctors had the right to use it for other purposes. True, it wasn't enough to save the child. The infant's actual parents made the final decision, not the grandpa.

1. **Did Charlie Gard Receive Justice?**

Charlie was not served justice, according to my perspective. This is shown when the court ruled against treatment because the patient was not as tiny as a child yet. The court also claimed that Mr. Hirano did not take time to assess Charlie's health for treatment (Wilkinson & Savulescu, 2018). This was particularly terrible because it was done by physicians who swore to safeguard people's lives, and in this instance, they lost the battle and gave up. It would be wise to cooperate with Mr. Hirano at Ormond Hospital and attempt therapy as possible.

1. **What Is The Role Of Beneficence In The Charlie Gard Case? Is It Necessary For Our Society To Do Good To Anyone? What About Our Health Care?**

Beneficence plays an important part in the case of Charlie because the nurse and physicians have done Charlie and his mother and grandparents no kindness and charity. The physicians could have only accepted the family's choice since Charlie was not sufficiently developed to make such judgments (Lantos, 2017). The physicians were supposed to hold Charlie till the end but gave up exceptionally early. We need to do well, and most of all, the health professionals. This is because they should obey the health standards of ethics, including compliance with the patient's choice.

1. **How Did The Principle Of Non-Maleficence Impact The Charlie Gard Case?**

The non-maleficence concept significantly affects Charlie's situation since it is evident that the Ormond hospital and its physicians did not follow this criterion. This principle says that a physician is obliged not to damage the patient, yet in this instance, the physicians helped murder Charlie by disconnecting him from the life-sustaining system (Wilkinson, & Savulescu, 2018). This showed plainly that Charlie was robbed of his excellent existence, which is contrary to that concept.

1. **Who Do You Think Had The Best Intentions For Charlie? The Medical Professionals, Researchers, Or Parents?**

In this instance, it is evident that Charlie's parents and researchers all had good intentions. Because they were ready to do all they could to try and rescue Charlie. The parents fully trusted the researcher Mr. Hirano and Hirano continued to believe in the therapy of researchers (Lantos, 2017). Perhaps the best interest in Charlie might have been the therapy if it were not for the court and the Ormond hospital physicians.
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